

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLII

JUNE, 1944

NO. 978

## *Secularism: Enemy of the Family*

MOST REV. KARL J. ALTER, D.D.

*Address delivered by the Bishop of Toledo at the Opening of the Family Life Conference at the Catholic University of America, February 28, 1944.*

THAT the State has some responsibility for the welfare of the family and therefore some authority respecting it must be accepted as a postulate of any social order. The pertinent question however is, how much responsibility and how much authority does the State rightfully possess. The answer to that question will be determined not only by the political philosophy which dominates a man's thinking, but also by the religion to which he adheres. The prevailing attitude of any society toward the family, viz., its autonomous nature or its subordination to the unrestricted will of the State, will usually be reflected in the fundamental law of a nation. Let us look at some existing State constitutions to illustrate the point.

Neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Bill of Rights makes any mention of the family. All

the emphasis is on the rights and duties of the individual citizen. The authority of the State, however, is definitely recognized as limited, for the document accepts as an axiom or antecedent postulate that every man is endowed by the Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Whilst no definition of these terms is given, it must be admitted as a logical sequence that the terms "liberty and the pursuit of happiness" imply the right to establish a family and achieve its purposes. At the time this document was written, it represented the most advanced thinking of liberal minds in terms of social and political philosophy.

More than a hundred and fifty years have passed since this Constitution was adopted. New social problems have arisen and there is a new orientation of mind reflected in the

fundamental law of recently organized states. Both the Communist and Fascist states place the major emphasis not on the individual but on the Community as a whole; that means that the collectivity and not the family or the citizen is the ultimate goal of State actions. The organized State is, of course, accepted as the supreme manifestation of the will of the Community and as a result the personal freedom of the citizen and the family have no claims as against the arbitrary interpretation of welfare or the economic efficiency of the collective community.

#### IRELAND AND PORTUGAL

In spite of this departure from earlier precedent, it is refreshing to find that those States which retained their hold on fundamental Christian truths still emphasize the rights of the individual. What is new and most encouraging is that they emphasize even more the rights of the family as the fundamental social unit in human society. In the new Constitution of Ireland, Article 41 begins thus: "The State recognizes the family as the natural, primary and fundamental unit group of society, and as a moral necessity possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior to all positive law." Article 42 of the same Constitution has this statement: "The State acknowledges that the primary and natural educator of the child is the family."

Even prior to the adoption of the

Constitution of Eire, we find an equally striking innovation in political thinking embodied in the Constitution adopted by Portugal in the year 1933. The whole of Section III of the first part of this document concerns the position of the family in the new Portuguese state. Article 12 enumerates the claims of the family to the protection of the state: "The State shall insure the Constitution and protection of the family, as the source of preservation and development of the race, as the first basis of education and of social discipline and harmony, and as a fundamental of political and administrative order." Article 14 of the same Constitution goes into even greater detail. We quote:

With the object of protecting the family it appertains to the State and to local authorities:

- 1) To encourage the establishment of separate homes under healthy conditions, and the institution of the family household.
- 2) To protect maternity.
- 3) To establish taxation in accordance with the legitimate expense of the family, and to promote the adoption of the family wage.
- 4) To assist parents in the discharge of their duty of instructing and educating their children and to cooperate with them by means of public institutions for education and correction, or by encouraging private establishments destined for the same purpose.
- 5) To take all effective precautions to guard against the corruption of morals.

It is interesting to note that the celebrated Encyclical of Pius XI on Christian Marriage entitled *Casti Con-*

*nubii* was issued late in December, 1930. No one who is familiar with this document can fail to observe a striking similarity between the two Constitutions mentioned above and the doctrine expounded by Pius XI concerning the rights and duties of families.

Pius XI, following in the footsteps of his predecessor, Leo XIII, requires that in the State "such economic and social methods should be set up as will enable every head of a family to earn as much as, according to his station in life, is necessary for himself, his wife, and for the rearing of his children." Furthermore the Pope continues:

If private resources do not suffice, it is the duty of the public authorities to supply for the insufficient forces of individual effort; particularly in a matter which is of such importance to the common weal, touching as it does the maintenance of the family and married people. If families, particularly those in which there are many children, have not suitable dwellings; if the husband cannot find employment and the means of livelihood; if the necessities of life cannot be purchased except at an exorbitant price; if even the mother of the family, to the great harm of the home, is compelled to go forth and seek a living by her own labor; if she, too, in the ordinary or even extraordinary labors of childbirth is deprived of proper food, medicine and the assistance of a skilled physician, it is patent to all to what an extent married people may lose heart, and how home life and the observance of God's commands are rendered difficult for them; indeed, how great a peril can arise to public security and to the welfare and very life of civil society itself . . . Wherefore those who have the care of the State and of the com-

mon good cannot neglect the needs of married people and their families, without bringing great harm upon the State and on the common welfare. Hence, in making the laws and in disposing of public funds, they must do their utmost to relieve the penury of the needy, considering such as one of the most important of their administrative duties.

### THREE FUNDAMENTAL VALUES

Our present Holy Father Pius XII reiterates this teaching of his predecessor in a broadcast of June 1, 1941, where he speaks of three fundamental values of social and economic life.

In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund roots of its greatness and power. If private property is to contribute to the good of the family, all public standards and especially those of the State which regulate its possession must not only make possible and preserve such a function—a function in the natural order under certain aspects superior to all others—but must also tend to perfect it.

No serious discussion of the interrelationship of the family, the State and the church with their respective rights and duties is possible unless we establish certain definite principles. It is utterly futile for one who accepts the democratic philosophy respecting the constitution of human society, with its emphasis on the personal dignity of the individual citizen, to debate this subject with one who adheres wholeheartedly to the doctrine of State absolutism with its emphasis on the collectivity. The Christian and the Communist will always remain poles apart in their concepts of ethical values and therefore of the relationship between

the State and the Family. What is said concerning Communism can be said likewise respecting Fascists and their ideology.

The function of the family with its rights and duties will be differently interpreted according as we accept natural law and Christian revelation or whether we reject these standards of judgment or criteria of values. Logically if there is no God, no future life, no spiritual principle called a soul, then there can be no supernatural revelation, no divinely established Church. Hence any claim of the Church to an authoritative voice in these matters respecting the family, in its organization and its function is a fraud and deceit. Religion, as Karl Marx declared, is merely "an opium of the people."

If however we accept the Christian view of life, then it is all important to know what God has said and decreed about the family; about marriage, parental authority, education of children, respective rights and duties of husband and wife and so forth. If God has made definite pronouncements in these matters and if we accept these truths, then, certainly, no mere human authority, whether it speaks in the name of science or in the name of social welfare or in the name of the State, has any right to tinker with the divine arrangements. The ethical values and the moral principles established by God concerning the family must in this supposition remain outside State jurisdiction.

#### FAMILY COMES FIRST

Pope Pius XI reminds us that there are

Three necessary societies distinct from one another and yet harmoniously combined by God, into which man is born: two, namely the family and civil society, belong to the natural order; the third, the Church, to the supernatural order. In the first place comes the family, instituted directly by God for its peculiar purpose, the generation and formation of offspring; for this reason it has priority of nature and therefore of rights over civil society. Nevertheless, the family is an imperfect society, since it has not in itself all the means for its own complete development; whereas civil society is a perfect society, having in itself all the means for its peculiar end, which is the temporal well-being of the community; and so, in this respect, that is, in view of the common good, it has pre-eminence over the family, which finds its own suitable temporal perfection precisely in civil society.

There exists, therefore, both an area of agreement and an area of conflict between the State authority and the Christian Church. The Church recognizes that the State has definite rights and responsibilities concerning the civil effects of marriage, the standards of education for citizenship, the security of the family against the hazards of life such as sickness, disability, old age, or unemployment. The Church, in fact, is ready to cooperate with the State in what is a truly scientific program of eugenics, but the Church, endowed with authority and responsibility regarding the sovereignty of God and the correct interpretation of the moral law, rejects the



supremacy of State authority in those things which concern the essential nature of the contract of marriage, its unity and indissolubility, its primary purpose, namely the rearing of offspring and the suitable training of such offspring for citizenship in the Kingdom of God.

The Church, therefore, rejects the right of the State to forbid marriage or decree divorce, compel sterilization, birth control, compulsory secular education or mere civil marriage. We realize clearly that as a result the loyal and faithful Catholic of today faces a difficult dilemma. His loyalty to God will be interpreted as disloyalty to his government. There can be no agreement in principle but only a *modus vivendi* between the Church and such states as arrogate to them-

selves supreme and unrestricted authority in these matters touching the family. We can only maintain with the Apostles that obedience to God takes precedence over submission to an usurped authority of the State. "We must obey God rather than man." In the final analysis we are safeguarding the fundamental principle of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from fear and freedom from unjust aggression. The position of the Church is fundamentally that of democracy which stands for the rights and the liberties of the individual, and is opposed to the unrestricted authority of the State. In defending, therefore, the family, its rights, its duties, its functions, we claim to speak as Americans, as honest liberals but especially as sincere Christians.



### *True Marriage*

The blessing of marriage is threefold: conjugal fidelity, offspring and the Sacrament. By conjugal fidelity it is procured that there should be no carnal intercourse outside of the bond of marriage with another man or woman; as regards offspring, that children should be born of love, affectionately cared for and given a religious education; as a sacrament, finally, that the bond of marriage should not be violated and that if a husband or wife are separated, they should not be joined with another even to produce offspring. This is the law of marriage by which nature's fecundity is adorned and the wickedness of incontinence is checked.—St. Augustine, *de Genesi ad litteram*, IV, 7, 12.

## *Plea for Families*

**MOST REV. BERNARD GRIFFIN, D.D.**

ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

ONE of the most pressing needs of the Church and country in this fair land of ours is the revival of Christian family life, which has suffered through the enforced absence of the father, through the removal of the children from the influence of their parents, and through the absence of the mother from her home during long periods of the day when she is in outside employment. The proper place for the mother with a young family is at home, looking after her children, and the greatest possible contribution she can make to the nation, even during war, is the upbringing and the physical, moral and spiritual education of her children.

We cannot overemphasize this. A nation depends for its well-being on sound Christian family life, and therefore we should endeavor to remove all those obstacles that exist to the restoration of Christian family life. The divorce courts and the means to easier divorce are a menace to the stability of the family and the nation. The manufacture and sale of those mechanical devices which would prevent the procreation of children should be prohibited, and a strict censorship should be exercised on films and books which extol the evils that attack the sanctity of the marriage bond and the sacredness of the family. For history has shown that the decline

of a nation has always begun with the disintegration of the family.

On the other hand, we should promote and encourage those projects which assist to restore family life in this country. We must get rid of the slums, and see that better and larger houses or flats are built for the families of the nation. Above all, we must create a sense of security in family life.

Following the principles given to us by the great Pontiffs Leo XIII and Pius XI, we believe that a system of family allowances ought to be introduced into this country. We hear that some such system already exists, with the dependents of our men and women with the fighting forces, and several industries have already schemes in operation. We welcome that particular scheme of family allowances outlined in the recent Government report on social security (Beveridge Report), provided always that the freedom of the individual and the family is secured.

As Pope Pius XI has said: "Every effort must be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay, which will guarantee every adult working man

just such a wage." The Holy Father continued: "In this connection we might utter a word of praise for various systems devised, and attempted in practice, by which an increased wage

is paid in view of the increased family burdens, and special provision is made for special needs." Those are the Holy Father's own words. They merit our prayerful attention and study.



### *Benedictines Return*

After an absence of 400 years, Benedictine monks are returning to the Abbey of Pluscarden, near Elgin, Morayshire, Scotland. They will immediately start on work of restoration. It is almost 400 years since, at the period of the "Reformation," the Benedictine monks left Pluscarden and its lands, which have since changed hands many times. Eventually it was purchased by the late Marquess of Bute, who spent \$150,000 on partially restoring the Abbey. On his death, the Abbey passed into the hands of his third son, Lord Colum Chrichton Stuart, who is now M.P. for Northwich (Cheshire). The abbey has now been sold to the Benedictines. Members of the Order from Prinknash, Gloucestershire, will go there shortly to establish a working community.

### *Religious Communities*

A total of 61 religious communities of men and 732 Congregations of Sisters are listed in statistics just published by the Sacred Congregation of Religious.

The religious communities of men have a total membership of 109,656, while the religious sisterhoods have a total of 586,646 members.

The largest single membership among the religious communities of men, according to the statistics, is that of the Society of Jesus. There are 26,303 Jesuits listed in 1531 houses and 76 novitiates throughout the world.

The largest religious community of women is shown to be the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, with a total of 43,525 throughout the world.

## Meeting the Divorce Problem

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

*Reprinted from the AVE MARIA\**

WHAT are the specifications which the Divine Architect has drawn up for the home? The first of these under the Christian dispensation is indissolubility. This is the divinely established safeguard for the unity and the permanence of the home.

"Is it lawful," asked the Pharisees, "for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"

"Have you not read," replied Our Lord, "that He who made man from the beginning made them male and female? For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh."

"Why then," they persisted, "did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put her away?"

"Because Moses," answered Christ, "by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery." (Matt. 19, 4-9).

From these words, the inference has been drawn by some of our non-Catholic friends that when a wife has

been guilty of adultery, her husband may not only put her away but may marry another. Such an inference, however, is unfounded. For Christ declares without any limitation:

"He who marries a woman who has been put away, commits adultery."

This can be true only on the supposition that the previous marriage remained intact, even though the husband had separated from his wife because of her infidelity. Hence, the meaning of Christ's answer to the Pharisees is: In case of infidelity to her marriage vows, a husband may separate from his wife, but if he contracts a new marriage he himself becomes an adulterer.

### GROWTH OF DIVORCE

Let us glance at the havoc wrought in the domestic life of modern society by the wedge—divorce. Three examples will suffice. In France, divorce, which was a comparatively recent innovation, in 1910 disrupted over seven thousand homes. By 1913 the number had mounted to more than fifteen thousand—an increase of over one hundred per cent. In 1921 the number had more than doubled, to 32,557. The number is still increasing. In Germany in 1900 there were 81 divorces for each 100,000 existing marriages. But in 1914 this number

\* Notre Dame, Indiana, November 13, 1943.

had climbed to 143 for each 100,000 marriages—an increase of over seventy-five per cent. In 1939, the number was still increasing.

In our country the rate of increase is even more alarming. From 1870 to 1900 the number of divorces per 100,000 married population jumped from 81 to 200—an increase of approximately 150 per cent. Forty years ago about one out of every twelve marriages celebrated in the United States terminated in divorce. Today about one in every six comes to a similar tragic end.

Thus the census bureau announced on March 25, 1942, that the 1940 divorce rate was the highest in history—264,000 divorces, or "better than one for every six marriages performed." That figure represents an increase of more than 200,000 over the 60,934 decrees granted in 1901. The previous high year was 1939, when 251,000 decrees were granted. Into the very marrow of modern civilization the wedge is penetrating deeper and deeper.

#### DIVORCE NO SOLUTION

Divorce is no satisfactory solution for difficulties and trials that inevitably arise in marriage. If in later years you could talk with the legions who rush to the divorce courts to find the "way out" of their discomforts, the overwhelming majority would tell you that the "way out" was the "way in" to deeper and more lasting sorrows. Such is the poignant testimony

of a woman writing in *Harper's* with the disillusionment which comes from sad and bitter experience.

"If I had to do it over again," she says, "I would not divorce my husband. And I wonder how many other divorcees wish that divorce had never been invented. Few will confess it because it is a human trait to disguise failure, to be reluctant to admit defeat even to oneself—and divorce is defeat. I am acknowledging that defeat, although even to my nearest friends I still carry through the stereotyped bluff, which indicates that I have borne unspeakable anguish with bravery."

She then tells how she divorced her husband because he drank. That was ten years ago, when she was thirty and her boy eight. The intervening years have been filled with loneliness, tears and aching regret. Everyone has shortcomings, she realizes now. Why hadn't she remained at his side, helping him to overcome his weakness instead of deserting him? It would have been better for her son, her husband and herself.

The son is permitted to spend one day a month with the father. When she calls at the country club to bring her boy home, she finds him on the tennis court with the father. He is lighting his father's pipe, then his own cigarette. A camaraderie rooted deep in their kindred natures has blossomed forth. Suddenly she feels like a kidnapper. For she is severing one of the most fundamental of kinships.

## PSYCHIC SCARS

When her son returns home from college, how desperately does she feel the need for someone to share her affection for him, her pride in the inches he has grown, her joy in his expanding maturity. The formal telephone call to let father know that he is safely home, is to her a chill reminder of her self-imposed solitude. She had called it her "freedom" when she was seeking her divorce, but she knows it now for what it is—an exile, a nostalgia, an aching loneliness.

Hers are the haunting regrets, the frustrated hopes, which remain as scars upon the hearts and minds of all those who have known the rapture of conjugal love and the sharing of common dreams only to have them cruelly blasted by divorce. As she looks back at the hopes, dreams and aspirations once anchored in the beneficent institution of marriage, and then at the empty, futile days that stretch ahead, she wishes desperately that she had not made the fatal mistake which every divorced person makes—the mistake of seeking happiness where it can never be found. If she had again the chance of ten years ago, she knows now that she would continue in marriage even though a thorn were found here and there among its fragrant flowers.

"We could go on together," she concludes, "trying to understand each other, sometimes perhaps succeeding. Always we should wait for our boy's train together, and together do what

we could to make the life for which we are mutually responsible a happy one. Together we should give him the comfort he now lacks of united parents—the tragic, desperate need of every child."\*

What pastor of souls has not listened to confessions of regret and disillusionment such as this?

## THE BEST PREVENTATIVE

"Father," said a young husband to me recently, "will you help Margie and me patch up our quarrel before it ends in divorce? I have a bad temper, and when angry say things I really don't mean. Margie has taken the baby home to her mother. That was three days ago. I've been beside myself since. I haven't been able to eat or sleep. God! How desperately I want a chance to start over again." His eyes were red from crying, and he made altogether a pathetic picture as he stood there fingering the rim of his hat.

When I called on Margie, her eyes were also red. Her boy of two was calling for "da da." She too was finding out that separation, instead of easing her pain, had intensified it. Yet such strange mixtures of love and stubbornness and pride are mortals that she had determined not to return until Joe begged her to do so. Like so many others, she was not going to make the first move.

How many marriages go upon the rocks of divorce through causes like this: husband and wife, still des-

\* *Harper's*, August, 1932, p. 321.

perately in love with each other, but each waiting for the other to make the first move toward reconciliation. Truly has it been observed that the hardest thing for most persons to say is: "I was at fault. I'm sorry. Please forgive me."

But sometimes it is inescapably necessary. Always it is the mark of character and the badge of magnanimity. And usually it is the best preventive of divorce.

#### THE PUBLIC WEAL—FIRST

Every nation or society wishing to survive must develop in its individual members a sense of social solidarity, and a willingness to sacrifice private interests for the public weal. In time of war the citizen is called upon to defend his country even at the risk of his life. The measure in which an individual is willing to subordinate his own selfish interests for the welfare of his family, his nation, or humanity in general, is largely the measure of his unselfishness and nobility of character.

When a marriage turns out badly, and the innocent victim feels tempted to have recourse to divorce and remarriage, Christ calls upon such a one to be willing to sacrifice his own selfish interests for the larger welfare of society as a whole. The Divine Master would have him remember that if an exception were made in his case, there could be no drawing of the line, and that in consequence the unity and permanence of marriage would in a large

measure be destroyed. An individual should recognize that in such circumstances he is called upon to play the role of a self-sacrificing hero and to place the public weal above his private interests. Such a one is no less worthy of the gratitude of his fellow-countrymen than is the soldier who defends his country from the attack of the enemy. Nor less worthy of the reward of Almighty God.

Did not Christ and His Blessed Mother set us the example of conforming to the law, even though in their case there was no real need for the performance of the required actions? Did not Christ as a little Babe undergo the rite of circumcision as demanded by the Mosaic Law, even though there was no real need for such purification in His case? Did not Mary present herself at the Temple forty days after the birth of Jesus and submit to the rite of purification as required by the Judaic law, even though her virginity was not impaired by motherhood? Thus did Christ and His Blessed Mother set an example to the Christians of all ages by obeying a law instead of claiming, as well they might, that exceptions be made in their case.

In the Church's unswerving stand for the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage, our American democracy has its strongest bulwark and support. By preserving the home intact, the Church is not only safeguarding the foundations of orderly government but she is also promoting the highest type of



family life. She is protecting the interests of husband, wife and children—and their happiness as well. In teaching her children to subordinate their private interests to the public weal, she is rendering an invaluable contribution to the development of the noblest type of American citizenship. Her uncompromising stand in defense of the permanent unity of the family fireside merits the praise of all our citizens

who place the welfare of their country and of society as a whole above the satisfaction of their private whims. In the ears of those who would ask the Church to lower her lofty standards in regard to Christian marriage, and would riddle her law of indissolubility with multitudinous exceptions, she would whisper again the words of the great Apostle, St. Paul: "Not I but the Lord commandeth."



### *Holy Mass*

To me nothing is so consoling, so piercing, so thrilling, so overcoming, as the Mass. It is not a mere form of words—it is a great action, the greatest action that can be on earth. It is, not the invocation merely, but, if I dare use the word, the evocation of the Eternal.

He becomes present on the altar in flesh and blood, before Whom angels bow and devils tremble. This is that awful event which is the end, and is the interpretation, of every part of the solemnity. Words are necessary, but as means, not as ends; they are not mere addresses to the throne of grace, they are instruments of what is far higher, of consecration, of sacrifice. They hurry on as if impatient to fulfil their mission.—*Cardinal Newman, LOSS AND GAIN, p. 327.*



### *Sacrament of Marriage*

The Sacrament of Matrimony can be regarded in two ways: first, in the making, and then in its permanent state. For it is a sacrament like to that of the Eucharist, which not only when it is being conferred, but also whilst it remains, is a sacrament; for as long as the married parties are alive, so long is their union a sacrament of Christ and the Church.—*St. Robert Bellarmine, De controversiis, III, 6.*

# Requirements of a Good Peace

MOST REV. EDWARD MOONEY, D.D.

*From a sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Detroit at the Pontifical Mass Offered March 13, 1944 in Blessed Sacrament Cathedral, Detroit, in Observance of the Fifth Anniversary of the Coronation of Pope XII.*

THE Pope, as a teacher of truth, has, from the outbreak of the war he tried so hard to prevent, focused world attention on the moral bases of a just peace. He recognizes the role which force must play in preserving peace, but he insists that power be used to protect and defend, not to lessen and suppress human rights.

More deeply than any other figure on the world scene he has analyzed the moral concept of peace and proposed programs of peace inspired by the highest practical idealism. Each one of us may ask himself if he is doing his part to keep the Pope's principles for peace before the minds of those whom he is in a position to influence.

In support of these principles the Pope has appealed not only to those who look to him as the shepherd of their souls, but to all men who recognize the sovereignty of God and the moral law which comes from God.

Last October men of authority in widely differing American religious groups, with impressive accord, gave wide publicity to a pattern for peace which in its every line is in fundamental agreement with the ideas and ideals of the Pope. I commend this statement for study and discussion in our

schools and colleges, in meetings of our Catholic societies and in every forum through which public opinion may be enlightened.

In his exposition of the basic requirements of a good peace, the Pope laid stress on two points which cannot be overemphasized. On the first of these two points there is particular need of emphasis in our own country. It is the demand for international co-operation through juridical institutions which will enable every State to take its place and discharge its duty in the family of nations.

It is pertinent to note that this feature of the Papal program for peace has not always been as prominent as it might well have been expected to be in the thinking of American Catholics on postwar settlement.

On another point which is basic in Papal teaching there is urgent need of emphasis everywhere in this decisive hour—"so full," as Pius XII has recently noted, "of possibilities for vast beneficent progress no less than for fatal defects and blunders." It is the fundamental moral requirement of fidelity to the pledged word.

Without the conviction, grounded on experience, that each party will respect compacts made and stand firmly

by its plighted word there can be no mutual trust. Without mutual trust there can be no enduring peace. If force rather than fidelity governs the relations of nation to nation, then we have tyranny and terror instead of confidence and peace.

Let me instance one case which is presently in the headlines of the newspapers in every free country. If fidelity to the plighted word were in honor among the nations today, the anguished sons and daughters of martyred Poland, who have suffered as no other people in this most brutal of wars, who have endured the most cruel

oppression with incomparable loyalty to faith and fatherland, would not have to stand in dread, as they now do, of the oncoming march of what the news despatches will, with unconscious sarcasm, call "an army of liberation."

Of old a pagan historian wrote in classic satire: "They have made a desert and called it peace." If we call that kind of thing "peace" today, it will be a sure sign that our moral standards have dropped below the pagan level. And the simple test may well be the fidelity of nations to their plighted word.



### *Religion and Intolerance*

We claim to be a Christian nation. If we are, we must live according to the principles of Christianity. To do that our children must know what those principles are, and have a solid training in the methods of putting them into practice. We adults must not only fight intolerance in religion, as we must fight intolerance of race; but we must also be united and stand shoulder to shoulder to promote the religious values which we feel are necessary for life. Surely there are enough things on which we can agree, without emphasizing the points on which we disagree. We should be big enough to do that, without any thought or danger of compromising the beliefs we hold.—*Most Rev. C. H. LeBlond, D.D., in the CATHOLIC CHARITIES REVIEW, March, 1944.*

# The "Pattern for Peace" and Public Opinion

EDWARD A. CONWAY, S.J.

*An address delivered at the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, D. C., April 11, 1944.*

UNTIL recently, religious observers entertained little hope that our manifestly secularist nation would stand firmly for a peace settlement based on the sovereignty of God and the prime applications of His moral law.

In November of 1942, for example, Benjamin L. Masse, S.J., wrote in *America*, expressing the fear that "The False Prophets of Secularism Would Wreck Our World Again." It is true that he described the steps that must be taken to prevent such a catastrophe; but at the time of his writing there seemed little chance that they would be taken.

Father Masse called upon "those who believe in God to destroy the dogma on which secularism is based, namely that religion is a matter of secondary importance in public life." They must, he said, "bring so much pressure to bear upon political leaders and statesmen that, whether there is question of national or international order, the necessity of conforming action and legislation to the Divine law will be taken for granted."

This, he said, was "the use of legitimate power to make public life reflect the private beliefs of our people. We are voters, taxpayers, consumers. We have the democratic right to see to it that our public servants respect our religious beliefs." "The task," he continued, "challenges all those who believe in God and the moral law. It will not be an easy task. Secularism will not give up without a fight. It has become

a habit of mind in the modern world—and habits are hard to break."

Father Masse concluded with words that now take on the character of prophecy: "Whether this one can be broken without the fraternal collaboration of all religious groups is a question which must be left to those who have the authority to answer it."

About a year later, on October 7, 1943, those in authority in the three great religious groups of America *did* answer the question by consenting to a degree of fraternal collaboration which produced the "Pattern for Peace."

The element of time had much influence on the decision to formulate the Pattern. The peace is already being made, piece-meal, if you will. It would be quite unrealistic to defer action in the expectation that some future full-dress Versailles session will be held. Anyone who hopes to have any influence on the settlement of the peace must act at once, and with energy.

What is more, they must act together. No one religious group, in the short time available, could hope to affect the secularist habits of a century—of excluding religion and morality from public life. Separately, they could hardly hope to exert much influence, let us say, in the Committee rooms of Congress. Congregational-

ists, Episcopalians, Catholics, Methodists, Jews, might bring their peace principles and programs to our policy-makers, and they would undoubtedly receive polite and interested attention. But even if our policy-makers should decide to act upon the religionists' proposals, which are they to follow? They would have the impression that each group was presenting a different plan. The very variety of plans would tend to confuse counsel, and our policy-makers, considering the fact that there are over one hundred religious peace programs current in the United States, might well be excused for not knowing exactly what the religious forces of the country really wanted them to do. Certainly they could not be expected to wade through the hundred programs in order to find out.

Hence the decision to formulate one pattern for peace which would express the areas of agreement found in the major peace statements of church and synagogue.

#### HAS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

It must be admitted that the "Pattern for Peace" falls short of the complete Christian program, as indeed it falls short of the complete Jewish program. But it does contain, as the Catholic signers wrote in their preamble, "the minimum requirements of a just peace," a peace, be it noted, which would be a real peace, not a mere truce, and during which time would be vouchsafed and conditions obtained in which the full religious prescriptions

for permanent peace could be worked out.

This will not satisfy the perfectionists. But we have said again and again that a half loaf is better than no bread. Given the shortness of time at our disposal, and the deep-seated character of our American secularism, we must have an instrument that can be used at once, and with the greatest possible effectiveness. The Pattern is therefore limited to principles which the majority of Americans of goodwill can agree to, and which our politicians and diplomats are likely to listen to. This was the thought behind the production of the Pattern. That it was not mere wish-thinking is proved by the fact that our politicians and statesmen have already listened to it, as I shall show shortly.

Complete press and radio coverage was given to the "Pattern for Peace" on October seventh. Both secular and religious editors were quick to recognize its news-worthiness. And well they might. It was, as the *Boston Traveller* said, "a common call without precedent in world history." The *Washington Post* called it "an historic document."

Through all the uniformly favorable editorial comment runs this theme: the political significance of the "Pattern for Peace." "Its goal," said *Newsweek*, "is to influence public opinion enough to force the diplomats to take heed." The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* saw that it could be a "potent force in arousing the people of

this country to the support of a realistic program . . ." *The Christian Century* said that it constituted a "tremendous fact which statesmanship must take into account"; "notice served on political leadership that it must submit its acts in making the peace to the review and judgment of church and synagogue as interpreters of the moral law." The editor of the *Church World* of Portland, Oregon, felt that "its real significance lay in the fact that for the first time in our national history there is a concerted effort to read religion into the peace program."

Quotations could be multiplied to show that editors throughout the country saw at once what a formidable factor the Pattern could be in the determination of our national peace policy. It is very surprising, therefore, that they should have missed, as all but a very few did miss, its almost immediate application in precisely those circumstances they foretold it would figure in. Only three weeks after its publication the "Pattern for Peace" played an important part in the deliberations of that body which, through its treaty-ratifying power, probably holds the fate of the next peace settlement in its hands, the Senate of the United States.

I strongly believe that the prominence of the Pattern in the Senate debate on the Connally Resolution on American international collaboration during the last week of last October is news quite as important as the issuance of the Pattern itself. To me, it

represents the first real breaching of the wall which secularism has raised to exclude religion and morality from public life. Now there is some small hope, at least, that the prophets of secularism will *not* wreck our world again.

As of October 25, 1943, we can no longer sustain the charge that religion and morality are given no voice in the deliberations of our policy-makers. It was on that day, the second of the debate, that Senator Pepper asked this question in the Senate of the United States:

What are the teachers, what are the preachers, what are the bishops, what are the rabbis, what is the clergy of America today saying about an effective international organization after the war?

Mr. President, I am confident that every Senator would like to know the solemn and deliberative opinion of 146 of the principal religious leaders of the United States, as embodied in a declaration made within the last month, entitled "Catholic, Jewish, Protestant Declaration on World Peace," issued by representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths.

Mr. President, the program of the religious leaders of the United States is contained in seven points. They are brief and they are pertinent, and I shall read them to the Senate.

The details of the ensuing debate may be read in the *Congressional Record* under date of October 26, for the legislative day of October 25. During that debate Senator Ball read a masterful letter from Monsignor Ryan on the weakness of the original Connally Resolution as compared with Point Five of the "Pattern for Peace." Sena-

tor Hatch then read into the body of the *Record* extracts from fifteen editorials emphasizing the political importance of the Pattern. Senator Pepper read a telegram from Rabbi Israel Goldstein, initial Jewish signer, which said in part: "In the name of the organized religious bodies of American citizens of Jewish faith we urge you to reject all resolutions failing to conform to minimum requirements for peaceful world set forth in Protestant, Catholic, Jewish resolution on world peace." Later in the debate a letter from John Foster Dulles, spokesman on this question for the Federal Council of Churches, expressing substantially the same idea, was also read. So, too, was a telegram to Senator Hatch from Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, Episcopal Bishop of Albany and President of the World Alliance for International Friendship. He expressed the hope that "the Senate would pass a resolution conforming more closely to the declaration of the churches."

#### TURNING POINT

I left the Senate gallery after that debate convinced that I had witnessed the Senate at a turning point in American political history. As I noted before, very few newspapers seemed to see anything remarkable in the event. One of the notable exceptions was the *Michigan Catholic*, which said editorially:

"Something occurred yesterday in the United States Senate that probably is unique in the history of Congress.

A declaration of the three religious groups of this country became a subject of debate in the upper house . . . and (was) interpreted as representing a considerable segment of public opinion."

"In all this," the editorial continued, "there is strong encouragement to Catholics to intensify their efforts to publicize the recent declaration."

I should add that the event described offers the same encouragement to Protestants and Jews to publicize the Pattern, for it is quite as much theirs as it is the Catholics' declaration.

I should like to bring under the most careful discussion the statement of the *Michigan Catholic* that the Pattern was "interpreted as representing a considerable segment of public opinion."

Just how correct was that interpretation?

Upon the honest, realistic answer to that question depends, I truly believe, the whole future of the Pattern, and, indeed, the peace of the future.

The editor of the *Michigan Catholic* was quite correct in saying that the Pattern was so interpreted. After reading the Pattern to the Senate, Senator Pepper said that it was obvious that "public opinion has formed behind a purpose for peace through an effective international organization." "The ministry," he said, "is pleading with the nation's representatives to effectuate these minimum requirements of such an organization or institution."

Senator Hatch went much far-



ther, at least by implication, when he said: "The important thing is the principle which has been laid down by these religious groups . . . on which for the first time in the history of this country they have gotten together. It is important that the principle endorsed by men representing as I understand some 60 million citizens be well considered by the Senate of the United States." (It is interesting and perhaps instructive to note that the reporter for the *Record* caught 16 instead of 60 million, and it is so written in the *Record*.)

It cannot be denied that Senators Hatch and Pepper did give the impression, entirely in good faith, I am sure, that the Pattern did represent a large segment of public opinion.

The crux of the question is here. Could it honestly be said that the Pattern did actually, on October 25, 1943, represent a considerable segment of public opinion?

I very much doubt it. The Pattern had been signed only three weeks previously. There had been no time to rally public support behind it. The educational campaign on its principles had not yet really begun.

The other Senators were not slow to recognize the point at issue. They showed great interest in the exact significance of the signatures. Senator Wherry, for example, asked point-blank if the signers "were speaking for the churches, or were voicing the opinion of the churches which they represent."

I need not emphasize the implications of that question.

How wonderful it would have been if Senator Pepper could have said in very truth: "Yes, it does represent the opinion, not only of the religious leaders who signed it, but of their communicants as well." It is a matter of *Record* that he replied: "I can say that I believe these eminent men, approximately fifty from each of the faiths mentioned, represent the sentiment of the religious leadership of the ministry of those three faiths."

Whatever our regrets may be about what might have been, the luminous fact remains that the moral minims of a just peace, as expressed in concert by Protestants, Catholics and Jews, were voiced in the Senate by Democrats and Republicans. It was the first Senate debate about the nature of the peace which will crown our victory.

The great and decisive debate, however, is yet to come. It will come when the Senate of the United States, and perhaps the House of Representatives, will be called upon to ratify the terms of the peace and the constitution of the international organization set up to preserve it. The "Pattern for Peace" can play an important part in that momentous debate. Already the Senators are familiar with its provisions. It has been read to them, as I have described. Senator Mead expounded its principles in the Senate on October 16; it has been printed three times in the *Record*.

I have been assured that the use of the "Pattern" contributed measurably toward winning the fight to strengthen the Connally Resolution. But let us not deceive ourselves. That limited objective was won not so much on the merits of the "Pattern" itself, or upon the weight of public opinion behind it, as on the standing of the signatories. Next time the Senator Wherrys will press for a definite answer to the question: "How many votes does the "Pattern" actually represent?"

No time must be lost in providing a resounding answer to that question. In words full of political wisdom, the Methodist Council of Bishops has warned that "The religious forces of the nation must exercise a decisive influence *at the place decision is made, before it is made*, so that their convictions may be regarded as creative and cooperative contributions. *Religious forces must not wait until decision is made and then protest.*"

#### "FRATERNAL COLLABORATION"

My refrain for the past year has been that if the religious forces of the nation want to exercise a really "decisive influence" they must unite in "fraternal collaboration" upon this common platform, and make it represent the votes of millions of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish citizens.

A beginning in the campaign to bring the "Pattern" to our American citizenry has already been made. You have heard, I am sure, of the pioneer "Syracuse Civic Gathering" on the

"Pattern" February 15. The inspiring story was told in *America* under date of March 25. 20,000 reprints of the article have been circulated. I quote these significant lines: "The men of Syracuse . . . knew that documents do not implement themselves, and that even the accord and approval of leaders does not—at least in a democracy—mean that intentions will be carried into action. Action, of the kind that will be important in making the peace, must come from the people—from the people making it clear to their representatives just what sort of peace they want."

3,500 citizens braved stormy weather to hear representatives of the three faiths discuss the principles of the "Pattern for Peace." Anyone who has read the newspaper publicity, and seen the full-page newspaper advertisements carrying the text of the "Pattern" for every citizen to read, must realize that in the "Civic Gathering" as pioneered by Syracuse, we have a mass education medium which it would be criminal to neglect. No secular peace organizations have been able to elicit such a response. The man in the street can be reached when he becomes the man in the pew. Which is just another way of saying that the moral arguments for a lasting peace really appeal to the masses of our people.

I do not hesitate to paraphrase Lincoln and say: "we can meanly lose or nobly use a golden opportunity."

We shall nobly utilize that golden

opportunity if we organize throughout the nation civic mass-meetings modeled on that of Syracuse. Already the formula has worked in San Antonio. It will work wherever it is tried.

In support of these civic gatherings we need a campaign to popularize the "Pattern" by radio, newspaper and magazine publicity. If the businessmen of Syracuse could be induced to pay for full-page ads in the Syracuse papers, the businessmen of other communities can be induced to do the same. Advertisers in the great national magazines are looking for copy like the "Pattern for Peace." The "Pattern" already has been featured in nationwide radio programs, on October 6 and December 25. Other programs should be arranged.

In his radio address, July 23, 1942, Secretary of State Cordell Hull called for "the formulation and proclamation of *common views* on the fundamental policies which will chart for mankind a wise course *based upon enduring spiritual values*." The "Pattern for Peace" provides the formulation of those views, common to Catholics, Protestants and Jews alike. "In support of such policies," he said, "an informed public opinion must be developed." The measures I have mentioned will go a long way toward developing that informed public opinion.

I am reminded that Sumner Welles, formerly Under Secretary of State, once warned that "without the active support of an informed public opinion, the policies of governments,

no matter how idealistic or desirable, will remain sterile, or actually disowned."

Mr. Hull continued with the sage observation that "the development of that public opinion is a task of intensive study, hard thinking, broad vision and *leadership*—not for governments alone, but for parents, teachers and *churchmen*, and all those who provide spiritual, moral and intellectual guidance." And he added emphatically: "Never did so great and compelling a duty devolve upon those in positions of responsibility, public and private."

Religious leaders of all three groups have long since recognized that great and compelling duty. They have begun to develop opinion among the citizens of their respective faiths, on the basis of the peace programs proposed by each group.

#### PUBLIC OPINION MUST UNITE

The time has come to unite all those streams of public opinion, which, providentially, are all flowing in the same direction. None of that force and flow need be lost. The "Pattern," as I have said, embodies the best natural law principles of peace found in all the religious peace programs. It is not a competing document, but a higher synthesis. It is a wide and deep channel into which all those streams may be directed, leading directly to the "place where decisions are made," the Capitol on the Hill.

If Catholics, Protestants and Jews now unite in "fraternal collaboration"

to stage civic mass-meetings on the "Pattern" in every community in the country, then, in the coming Congressional debate about America's part in the peace, we can truly say that the original signers of the "Pattern for

Peace" do really represent the opinion of their people.

Then, and only then, will the "Pattern for Peace" have become "a tremendous fact which statesmanship cannot from now on ignore."



### *Church and Citizenship*

The more closely the temporal power of a nation aligns itself with the spiritual, and the more it fosters and promotes the latter, by so much the more it contributes to the conservation of the commonwealth. For it is the aim of the ecclesiastical authority, by the use of spiritual means, to form good Christians in accordance with its own particular end and object; and in doing this it helps at the same time to form good citizens, and prepares them to meet their obligations as members of a civil society. This follows of necessity because in the City of God, the Holy Roman Catholic Church, a good citizen and an upright man are absolutely one and the same thing. How grave, therefore, is the error of those who separate things so closely united, and who think that they can produce good citizens by ways and methods other than those which make for the formation of good Christians. For, let human prudence say what it likes and reason as it pleases, it is impossible to produce true temporal peace and tranquility by things repugnant or opposed to the peace and happiness of eternity.—*Card. Silvio Antoniano, Dell' educaz. crist., I, 43. Cited and translated in the Encyclical CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF YOUTH, Pius XI.*



### *Increase in Negro and Indian Population*

The report of the Commission for Catholic Missions among the Colored People and Indians in the United States shows the colored Catholic population to be 313,259, an increase of 6,428 over last year, and the Indian Catholics to number 94,085, an increase of 2,481.

## Litany of the Sacred Heart

Reprinted from *The CATHOLIC LEADER*\*

As we scan the table of contents, or turn over the leaves of our prayer-books, the words "Litany of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus" meet our eyes. How many of us pause to consider the pathetic and interesting history of that same Litany? It is embalmed in floods of human tears, and oceans of Divine love.

In the year 1720, just thirty years after the death of St. Margaret Mary, an extraordinary event occurred which silenced forever most of those who hitherto mocked and sneered at the Devotion to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus. A most virulent pestilence from the East broke out in the City of Marseilles in France. Some writers describe it as a plague without parallel in human history! At that time the population of Marseilles was 80,000 people; of those 80,000 more than 39,000 were carried off, victims of the terrible scourge.

The city became like a cemetery encumbered with countless unburied corpses. The saintly Prelate of Marseilles, Monsignor de Belzunce, filled with mercy and compassion for his stricken flock, was heartbroken; he and his heroic priests worked day and night, risking their lives, and only too willing to give their own lives for the salvation of their people and the cessation of the insatiable scourge.

Prayers, penances, pilgrimages

and processions were organized; it seemed a matter of hoping against hope. Had the charity of all grown cold? Would God's face be turned against the city and its people forever? No; has not the Holy Ghost said (*Ecclesiasticus ii*), "My children, behold the generations of men! and know ye that no one hath hoped in the Lord and hath been confounded?" Eternal Truth hath spoken these words. A message came to the brave and saintly Bishop from a Visitation nun, Sister Ann Madeline Remusat, exhorting and begging him to place all his hope in the Most Adorable Heart of Jesus Christ.

The good Bishop humbly received the message as a Heaven-sent inspiration. He ordered and arranged a Solemn Consecration of his diocese to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus. He commanded invocations, prayers, penitential exercises, processions and a solemn novena. During this solemn novena, for nine days, not only the churches, but the streets of the city, resounded with the invocations to the Most Sacred Heart sung, amidst sobs and tears, by men, women and children. November 2, 1720, was the day fixed for the great solemn procession of public repentance; on that day the worn and emaciated Bishop, with the faith and fortitude and zeal of the heroic Borromeo, walking in his bare

\* 541-5 Ann St., Brisbane, Australia, July 8, 1943.

feet, with a rough cord around his neck, carrying a large cross, led the penitential procession.

He was followed by his priests and religious and members of the living laity not yet stricken by the plague. Having reached the principal square of Marseilles, the Bishop knelt, and, amid silence sometimes broken by pent-up cries and groans of the weeping multitudes, solemnly consecrated his entire diocese to the Most Adorable Heart of Jesus. From that hour the plague ceased. Heart of Jesus, Burning Furnace of Charity, have mercy on us!" The prayer was heard then.

#### PRIDE AND HUMAN RESPECT

But that was not the end. Then, as now, some civil rulers placed more hope in men than in God. Pride and vanity and human respect kept the municipality of Marseilles away from all the religious exercises and processions of repentance. Those men stood sullenly aloof, and sometimes mocked those who continued to sing the invocations to the Most Sacred Heart.

Two years later the plague returned. Many of the mockers were smitten. The members of the municipality who took no part in the penitential processions two years ago now repented of their folly. The fearless Bishop reminded them, in a loving but dignified manner, of their utter and shameless neglect of charity to

God and their neighbor during the plague two years ago. What would they do now to prove the honesty of their amendment? They now understood their thoughtless folly of the past; their repentance was indeed true. They vowed publicly that they would always fulfil their Easter duty of confession and Holy Communion; that every year on the Feast of the Most Sacred Heart they would, as a body, receive Holy Communion publicly in the Church of the Visitation and there offer a snow-white candle ornamented with the arms of the city; moreover, they would, on the same feast, as a public body take part in the procession in honor of the Most Sacred Heart.

A document was drawn up containing all those solemn promises of the members of the municipality. As soon as the document was signed by all the officials, the plague ceased. "O Sacred Heart of Jesus, in Thee we trust!" "Heart of Jesus, Salvation of those who trust in Thee, have mercy on us."

When the plague ceased, the grateful people of Marseilles continued to use the invocations consecrated by tears and touching memories; it was called the "Litany of Marseilles." In 1899 Pope Leo XIII approved the Litany of Marseilles, to which he added six new invocations. Thus the present litany of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus has come to us.

# The Approach to Labor

STANLEY B. JAMES

Reprinted from *The HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW*\*

"To priests in a special way," says Pope Pius XI in *Divini Redemptoris*, "We recommend anew the oft-repeated counsel of Our Predecessor, Leo XIII, to go to the working man. We make this advice Our own, and, faithful to the teachings of Jesus Christ and His Church, We thus complete it: 'Go to the working man, especially where he is poor; and in general, go to the poor.'" This counsel is further emphasized by the declaration in the next paragraph that, to this purpose, all else should be subordinated. "Every other enterprise," says Pius XI, "however attractive and helpful, must yield before the vital need of protecting the very foundations of the Faith and of Christian civilization. Our parish priests, therefore, while providing of course for the normal needs of the Faithful, must dedicate the better part of their endeavors and their zeal to winning back the laboring masses to Christ and to His Church."

Taken in their context the words imply more than a temporary measure. Were they only that, we might be justified in supposing that the situation could be met by readjustments of a superficial character. And this would mean halfheartedness in tackling the problems and consequent ill-success. Before adequate response can be made

to the Pope's counsel, the crisis must be viewed in all its gravity. The fundamental change required must be accepted. That done, it may be possible to enlist the earnest attention and serious study which the problem deserves.

## A NEW CHAPTER IN HISTORY

The truth is that we are beginning a new chapter in the history both of the world and of the Church. "The social basis of the Church," said Berdyaev (in *Christianity and Class War*), "is changing, and the new one must be formed principally of workers, with a minority of intellectuals; no more nobles, no more of the old commercial class. The society of the future will be a working society, and the Church will be able to live in accordance therewith as she did with the societies of the past, continuing to be the guardian of the eternal truths which she offers to the souls of mankind." In close accordance with this was the statement made in a communication addressed to Cardinal Verdier, Archbishop of Paris, by the then Cardinal Pacelli, speaking for His Holiness. Said His Eminence: "In the complexity of the modern world the working classes take on a growing importance, an importance which it would be stupid and unjust to under-

\* 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., April, 1944.



estimate. The extent to which the representatives of labor are penetrated with the principles of the Gospel will decide in large measure the extent to which the society of tomorrow will be Christian."

It is customary to speak as though the contemporary conflict was between a middle-class society retaining and anxious to preserve at least some relics of its Christian tradition and a proletariat entirely hostile to that tradition. In this view Christianity is confused with bourgeois respectability, and the struggle is seen to be one between a class that has to some extent recognized canons of moral decency and a class identified with atheistic materialism. This implies two distinct errors.

#### BOURGEOISIE VS. PROLETARIAT

In the first place, the issue of the contest between bourgeoisie and proletariat is a foregone conclusion. Stated in religious terms, the Master of the Feast, noting the refusal of the prosperous and comfortable to accept His invitation, has turned to others. Pius XI's "Go to the workingmen" is an echo of the command: "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city and bring in hither the poor and the feeble and the blind and the lame." Because we reject Marx's dialectical materialism, according to which the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is the inevitable consequence of the preceding industrial conditions, we need not reject his assertion that in the near

future the workers will constitute the dominant class; this assertion is capable of a Christian interpretation. Its *apologia* is to be found in the parable just quoted and in the historical failure (registered in recurrent wars) of the bourgeoisie to use for the glory of God the magnificent opportunity which the decline of feudalism gave it. As St. Paul turned from the Jews to the Gentiles, so does the Christian apostolate of today turn from the middle-class to "the poor and the feeble and the blind and the lame." The declining power of the former marks a Divine judgment of a momentous character indicative, as was St. Paul's decision, of a fresh stage in human history.

In the second place, it is misleading to identify the proletariat with the ideology and culture exemplified by the Russian revolutionists. Marx exploited the sufferings and discontent of the poor in the interests of his materialistic and anti-Christian philosophy. That philosophy, instead of springing out of the proletarian soul, is the product of a middle-class *intelligentsia*. Labor has not yet found itself. It stands at present at the crossroads between a spiritual and a materialistic interpretation of the universe. Its earlier phase in the English-speaking world owed much to Christian idealism. Methodism bore no small part in inspiring and training its leaders and speakers. "At first sight," writes Graham Wallas (in his Introduction to the late Professor

Halévy's *History of the English People*), "Evangelical Christianity and non-Christian Radicalism would seem to be at the opposite poles of human thought. But when, forty years ago, I first became a practical politician, I discovered how strong was the tradition of a working alliance between the two forces." If the present writer, at one time closely identified with the Labor movement in Great Britain, may venture to quote his own experience, it will be to confirm this. The Christian Socialism, as it was called, of the nineteenth century created a powerful tradition which lasted up to the time of the War. Since that time it has been in decline. The materialistic element (not necessarily theoretically materialistic) is triumphing.

#### NATURE AND GRAVITY OF THE CRISIS

Thus, the real crisis today is not that occasioned by the clash of bourgeoisie and proletariat; it is that occasioned by the conflict, within the proletariat, of these two antagonistic philosophies—the spiritual and the material. The question as to the dominance of the workers is settled in their favor. The vital question which remains to be answered is as to which type of Labor will give its color to the new era. As Cardinal Pacelli said: "The extent to which the representatives of labor are penetrated with the principles of the Gospel will decide in large measure the extent to which the society of tomorrow will be Christian."

Both the nature and gravity of

the crisis can now be seen. In that crisis the Catholic Church has a decisive part to play. There is no prospect that the workers will turn again to those Protestant and Evangelical sources of inspiration which served them in earlier days. Nor, even if they were able to do so, would they find in the emotionalism of the Revivalists any adequate means for overcoming the power of a centralized, organized and dogmatic Communism. It is true that Wesley's activities did much to prevent a repetition of the French Revolution on the other side of the Channel, but there is a profound difference between the French and Russian Revolutions, and present-day Evangelicalism is hopelessly handicapped should it attempt to repeat its achievement in the early nineteenth century. There remains as a medium for Christianizing the workers only the Catholic Church, now as always the sole guardian of the Faith and Universal Pastor of the Peoples. The choice of those workers to whom is falling a dominating share in the government of world affairs is limited to Catholicism and Communism.

Such adaptation as may be necessary in order to cope with the responsibility as thus defined must be therefore something more than a temporary expedient. A readjustment of ecclesiastical machinery is not enough. Even the adoption of the methods indicated by the program of Catholic Action, unless accompanied by a corresponding inner change, would prove

ineffective. Catholic Action supposes something which it is scarcely an exaggeration to describe as a spiritual revolution adapted to the situation created by the social revolution and on a scale commensurate with the social revolution.

#### ANSWER TO AN OBJECTION

It may be objected that, for this undertaking, the Church needs no adaptation. The hospitality with which she welcomes to the altar rails those of all classes, the social catholicity she exhibits in such strong contrast to the bourgeois character of the sects, her numerous philanthropies and the specially gracious spirit in which she is able to minister to the unfortunate, not to speak of the manner in which her forms of worship and public teaching meet the needs of the illiterate—all these facts give her strong claims to be considered as the Church, *par excellence*, of the Poor—a title which is, indeed, already accorded her. That is true, and yet it must be remembered that methods suited to a class of passive sufferers, too sunk in poverty and too hopeless of change to offer any resistance save that of apathy, must prove unfitted to the modern, class-conscious and actively hostile masses of today. Remember that the call to "go to the working-man" occurs in a context which defines an apostolate to those immense multitudes who, in Pius XI's words, "because they were not understood or treated with the respect to which they

were entitled, in bitterness have strayed far from God." It is a proletariat which has a religion and a dogmatic creed of its own that has to be approached. We are not now thinking of the simple-minded, tractable and respectful poor of the past, but of a class which has imbibed large doses of anti-Catholic propaganda based on the Church's alleged alliance with the monied class. When we speak of the Church as "the Church of the Poor," we must be careful to define the meaning of the term, "poor." If by it is meant the class-conscious proletariat of our mines, factories and workshops, then the phrase is misleading. And it is in this latter sense that the word is used in *Quadragesimo Anno* and other Social Encyclicals.

But there is a deeper sense in which the Church is now and always has been "the Church of the Poor," however that word be understood. The Object of her worship is One who, though Incarnate God, lived and labored for many years as a village carpenter. The fact that Our Lord was the Child of a working-class Mother is not to be reckoned as "an accident of birth" without any particular relevance to His mission. You and I have no choice as regards the circumstances of our nativity. Our social position is due to the force of circumstances rather than to any voluntary and deliberate action. In the case of Our Lord this was not so. He chose to be a carpenter. The social preference thus shown was confirmed when He se-

lected the majority of His Apostles from the same lowly class. According to the public which he desires to reach, a trader chooses the newspaper medium through which to advertise his goods. If Jesus chose as His Apostles those whose social status gave them special facilities for reaching the working class, it may be fairly presumed that it was this class which He intended should form the human foundations of His Church. Nor does this apply to the apostolate for which St. Peter was responsible; it was to a man who worked with his hands at weaving that the apostleship to the Gentiles was committed. Nor were the results of this choice other than what might have been expected. "Look to your calling, brethren," wrote St. Paul, addressing the Corinthians, "that there are not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble." The story told in the Acts of the Apostles takes us into the ghettos of the Near East. If the truth must be told, these first Christians, whether in Asia or Europe, constituted a somewhat unsavory crowd of dock laborers, artisans, slaves. As it was the Jew who formed the racial nucleus of the Church, so was it these humble folk who formed its social nucleus.

The significance, from the standpoint of the contemporary situation, of the communistic effects wrought by the Pentecostal experience scarcely needs to be pointed out. The Church that was formed by the action of the Holy Spirit corresponded closely, as

we might expect it would, to the anticipations of Our Lady's Magnificat and to the teaching of Christ's Beatitudes. "Only the proletariat can emancipate the proletariat," said Marx. The Church, having regard to her essential character, in approaching the workers is able without any adaptation of her fundamental character to fulfil that condition. It was no mere opportunism that led Pius XI to say, "Go to the workers," but a reversion to the original character of the Christian apostolate.

That, however, is just where the difficulty lies. It is a fixed principle regulating Catholic policy that the Church shall respect the political and social powers. Whether it finds itself under a monarchy or a republic, it is the same; it renders to whatever Caesar may be in possession of authority that which is his. So also with social classes. Feudalism found it respecting the authority of the nobles. When the change came at the end of the Middle Ages, it accommodated itself to the regime of the bourgeoisie. That regime has lasted so long and the habit of mind formed under its influence has become so fixed that readaptation must be, as all such readaptations are, difficult and even painful.

Moreover, there is a special difficulty in this case. The new trading class which succeeded to the impoverished nobility was rich and could offer material inducements as an argument for ecclesiastical support in its opposition to the workers' cause. And

it is so easy for the Church's moral disapproval of Communism to become, under the soporific of bourgeois patronage, merged in this class-interest. Plutocracy is glad to exploit Catholic condemnation of proletarian materialism, and the fact that it does so in the interests of its own particular type of materialism is not always made clear to those concerned. It needs a vigilant spirit and a discerning mind not to fall into the trap and at the same time to avoid a compromising endorsement of the workers' claims.

#### SPECIFIC DUTIES OF TODAY

We reach the point towards which our argument has been bringing us when we say that the problem is one which demands as the primary condition of its solution an abundant release of the spiritual resources resident within the Church. For what has to be achieved is nothing less than a recovery of the spirit which animated the first generation of Christians, a renewal of the simplicity manifested in the Gospels and the Acts. That the same costly preference for the poor as we find in Our Lord's own ministry and in that of the Apostles should release us from the stranglehold of a patronizing plutocracy, and leave us free to "go to the workingmen" as accredited representatives of the Divine Carpenter, involves a renunciation of material prospects which only a strong faith and a limitless charity towards our opponents can make possible.

Times of spiritual renewal are functional. That is to say, they are given for the performance of specific tasks. The Holy Spirit comes in no indeterminate way, but in response to the need created by some overwhelming task such as would be, without his aid, impossible. It is the sense of human weakness, under the pressure of our apostolic obligations, forcing out of us the cry for Divine wisdom and strength which is the primary condition of His advent. A glance at the serried ranks of the revolutionary proletariat organized on a worldwide scale is calculated to beget in us a mood of impotent despair, and to suggest a speedy retreat into the comforting arms of a bourgeoisie only too willing to persuade us that the contemplated mission to the workers is hopeless. But there is another way in which we may react to the formidableness of our responsibility—a rediscovery of the power and wisdom which, having enabled a few Jewish peasants to conquer the Roman Empire, has again and again in the Church's history achieved the "impossible." And, prior to the War, that power was already operating to usher in the new age. It was not empty rhetoric which Cardinal Verdier employed when, addressing 80,000 young workers gathered round the altar in a Paris stadium, he said: "You, dear children, with Christ, with the Church, nourished by the doctrine and full of the life of the Faith, have sworn to work the miracle that we in our timidity no

longer counted on. Tomorrow, thanks to you, your lives and your doctrine, the world of labor, for its happiness and for ours, for the glory of your

country and for the good of humanity, will throw itself into the arms of Christ, our God. Children of the miracle, we bless you. God be with you.



### *Nobility of Work*

The Roman Empire with all its material progress and vaunted culture could well hang its head in shame because slaves outnumbered free men. In speaking before the Roman Senate the classic orator Cicero did not hesitate to declare: "There can be no dignity in the workshop." That pagan philosophy was for the first time confuted in the workshop at Nazareth where Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and His foster father, St. Joseph, worked with brawn and brain, hardened their hands with honest effort, and forever sanctified and ennobled manual labor.—*Most Rev. Francis Buddy, D.D., in THE SOUTHERN CROSS, February 11, 1944.*



### *Catholic Colleges and Labor*

Catholic college graduates must supply leadership to labor. This means that they must be willing to begin at the beginning, which, in cases, means at the bottom. This is particularly true of women. Catholic colleges must help supply to the vast majority of unorganized women workers the intelligence and the idealism without which labor organizations are merely pressure groups. The Catholic Church has a practical program of social reform that is based upon tried, true principles of social justice.

It should be the considered vocation of Catholic graduates to implement these principles into action by working beside the worker, and letting those principles of unity and justice be made articulate.—*Most Rev. J. Francis A. McIntyre, D.D.*

## THE EDITORIAL MIND

### *To Combat Prejudice*

**F**OMENTERS of anti-religious and anti-racial feeling are becoming increasingly active in this country.

They are publishing articles and advertisements in periodicals. Their activities are being abetted by those who whisper unjust charges against entire religious and racial groups.

This circumstance lends point to the endorsement given by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman to a four-point program to combat disunity arising from wholesale accusations. The program, which was issued by the American Jewish committee, is as follows:

1. I will spread no rumor and no slander against any sect (faith).
2. I will never try to indict a whole people by reason of the delinquency of any member.
3. I will daily deal with every man in business, in social, and in political relations, only on the basis of his true individual worth.
4. In my daily conduct I will consecrate myself, hour by hour, to the achievement of the highest ideal of the dignity of mankind, human equality, human fellowship, and human brotherhood.

The "dignity of mankind" is founded in the fact that all men are children of God and brothers of Jesus Christ, their Divine Saviour.

Dealing with a man "on the basis of his true individual worth" is

in accord with the moral law. It also harmonizes with the Declaration of Independence which proclaims that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."—*The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, Michigan, January 20, 1944.*

### *Sanctity and the Crisis*

At some time in his adult life it suddenly dawns upon every Catholic how frightfully superficial has been his application of Catholic dogma to his own personal life. Then he thumbs through Chesterton and is uncomfortably startled to see that great mind calmly writing: "Christianity cannot be accused of failure, because Christianity has not yet been tried." Or he reads *The Good Pagan's Failure*, by Rosalind Murray, and is reminded that Christendom has never yet been wholly *Christian*: there has always remained in it a "pagan" leaven at work.

In the last 400 years that leaven has increased in activity until in the 19th century Christendom—the Western World—was more pagan than at any time since the "Dark Ages." The greatest upheaval occurred in the 16th



century with the division of Christians themselves, and this is the disease which brought about the present chaos into which men's relations have fallen. The chaos is complete, for it involves religion, metaphysics, morals, social and economic relations. This war is its ultimate expression—the most inhuman war, all things considered, that ever afflicted the human race. Despite the unprecedented scientific knowledge and physical equipment at his disposal, more than enough to insure permanent peace and universal prosperity, man is busily engaged in enshrouding whole continents in silence, death, and darkness. Never before have great civilizations been so thoroughly destroyed from within.

The barbarians who came down from the North upon Rome had a certain freshness of youth about them; the "barbarians" of today are the products of Christendom's own internal disease. To the truly Catholic intelligence the cause and nature of this pathology are clear. Man has forgotten God. Catholics are ignorant, not only of Catholic theology, but of the whole Catholic philosophy of life. There is a great deal of Catholic activity, frantic study of economic and political and social problems, but too little Catholic living. "Seek ye first the kingdom of heaven," said our Divine Master, "and all these things (political reform, economic reform and social reform) will be added unto you." Not until at least a dynamic minority of Catholics is actively engaged in an all-

out pursuit of sanctity can we hope for Christian peace. 1900 years ago Christ gave us the infallible therapeutic for every ill now afflicting civilization. In our blindness we fail to see it. The therapeutic is heroic personal sanctity. There is no other way.—THE SOUTHERN CROSS, *San Diego, California, March 24, 1944.*

### *Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill*

The fact that Catholic leaders object to the phrasing of the health provisions in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill does not warrant the erroneous conclusion that they or the Catholic Church in this country are opposed to extension of medical and hospital service.

For those conversant with history there is no question of the Church's favorable attitude toward hospitals and medicine. As soon as she emerged from the catacombs, the Church founded hospitals. Since then members of religious orders in great numbers have devoted their lives to the care of the sick. With the aid and patronage of the Church medical schools were established at Catholic universities many centuries ago, and medical men were encouraged in their researches and discoveries.

American Catholics favor development of a national health program that will benefit as many persons as is possible. This is obvious from a statement issued on behalf of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United

States and Canada in collaboration with the Social Action department of the National Catholic Welfare conference.

"The Catholic group of citizens," says the statement, "should give hearty support to the Federal government in its efforts to extend both governmental and voluntary hospital and medical care systems into areas in which needs are recognized." "The partnership between the voluntary agencies and governmental agencies in health care must be progressively emphasized," but there should be a true partnership and not merely "a cooperative effort in which the government is dominant." "The principle of prepayment against the costs of eventual illness must be accepted," says the statement further, "and plans developed to encourage each individual through such prepayment to make preparation against the hazards of illness."

Catholics favor the utmost possible extension of medical service consonant with our democratic ideals of government and Christian teaching on charity and the rights of the individual, whether a patient, physician or nurse in a hospital. They do not approve any tendency to make citizens more and more wards of the government.

Washington observers expect a battle royal over the Wagner bill. During the debate the country will be made more aware of wonderful things that medical science has accomplished, and of the difficulty that so many, es-

pecially in the lower-income brackets, experience in profiting by medical progress. More publicity than ever before will be given to group medical-care plans and provisions for hospitalization. All that should prove beneficial.—*The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, Mich., April 6, 1944.*

### High School Retreats

It is almost fifteen years since Pope Pius XI wrote his famous Encyclical, *Mens Nostra*, encouraging more widespread attendance at religious retreats. After outlining the many spiritual benefits to be gained from such religious exercises, the Holy Father urged retreats for Catholics of all classes and ages. Retreats for young people were especially dear to his heart.

If the late Holy Father had been privileged to witness the retreats conducted this week in our diocesan high schools, he would have found great cause for joy. Indeed, any Catholic would have found cause for joy in seeing the many thousands of our Catholic high school students going about the serious work of their annual Holy Week retreat. From Monday until Wednesday afternoon these young people laid aside their regular school work to engage actively in a study of the things of the soul.

Every Catholic school exists to prepare our young people for time and for eternity. The things of God become part and parcel of every school

day, yet it is deemed of immeasurable value to devote the time of the annual retreat to a closer scrutiny of spiritual matters. It is true that these young people have opportunity for religious exercises of this sort in their parish churches, but a school retreat provides special advantages. The retreatants form a similar-age group; they have their own specific problems, which can be met directly; they have the advantage of mutual example from classmates whom they know so well; they have in their annual retreat a concrete expression of our reasons for maintaining separate Catholic schools, in which religion is the chief influence.

As one visited our high schools and witnessed so many thousands of young people making their retreats, it became so evident that not only private and personal interests were being served. Religious retreats for teen-age persons serve a community purpose as well. If only it would have been possible to take into our schools the "experts" who are attempting to meet the juvenile delinquency problem! Perhaps they would have learned that, in dealing with this community problem, it is more important to teach teen-agers to pray, than to play—that the chapel is more important than the recreation center and the playground. There is very little chance that the high school student who takes his retreat seriously will ever become a delinquency problem. Pleased as Philadelphians must be by this contribution of our Catholic high schools, they

should be disappointed that 60,000 public high school students of the same age group did not share in such a noble undertaking.—*The CATHOLIC STANDARD AND TIMES, Philadelphia, April 7, 1944.*

### *Public Penance*

M. Maritain, the eminent Christian philosopher, made a suggestion recently which sounds strange enough in modern ears: it was that the people of the United Nations should not only pray, but hold great processions and public demonstrations to confess and bewail their offenses against God. In the ages of Faith, such action would have been regarded as an obvious piece of wisdom on the part of sane Christian men. Those who lived then had no illusions about their superior national virtues—they knew themselves for sinners, like Christ's publican, and like the Ninevites: and they knew that sackcloth and ashes are powerful to avert the Divine judgment on apostate man.

We don't think like that nowadays, do we? No—even many Christians would find such a public humiliation ridiculous. Besides—the hour for seeking deliverance is past. We are close to victory: "No power on earth" can save Hitler now, or Japan tomorrow. Maybe—but what power on earth can bring God's peace out of the self-assertive pride of nations whose hearts are far from Him?—*THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, December 16, 1943.*

# Anti-Semitism

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

Reprinted from RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THE question of anti-Semitism is so grave, and of such immediate, practical importance that nothing should be neglected which may help to clarify it.

It is my belief, offered for what it is worth, that anti-Semitism can much more effectively be dealt with, if it is understood as something distinct from anti-Jewish prejudice, even though closely related to the same. A word of explanation may make this clear.

In the minds of a great many people, Jews and non-Jews, the two phenomena appear to be confounded. If people are prejudiced against the Jews, therefore they are judged anti-Semitic. Such thinking confuses the specific, unique phenomenon of anti-Semitism with a type of social attitude that, from its nature, is not peculiar to the relations of Jews and non-Jews. Inter-group prejudice is found in all types of group relationships: white and Negro, occidental and oriental, native and foreigner, etc.

The causes and manifestations of anti-Jewish prejudice, are, in general, the same as those which arouse prejudice against various unlike social groups, or which develop out of them. People will be antagonistic to the Jews as foreigners, or they will attribute to an entire group the weaknesses

and anti-social characteristics of individuals, or they will be influenced by legends or legendary attributes, or economic rivalry will result in racial jealousy. People will generalize from unpleasant personal experiences. They will manifest towards the Jew the spirit of vindictiveness which, under other circumstances, they show to the Negro or the foreigner. Such conduct finds its unfortunate issue in immoral or illegal discriminations. The prevalence of anti-Jewish prejudice is the natural breeding ground for anti-Semitism, but it is not yet the fullfledged article.

By anti-Semitism I would understand a distinct phenomenon or movement which is marked by the following traits:

1. A *positive body of ideas*: an ideology, in the full sense of the term. This body of ideas or doctrine busies itself with ascribing to Jews or to Judaism the origin of all, or nearly all, the social ills of the entire world. It is a distinct *Leyenda Negra*, or Black Legend, applied to the Jews, as Anglo-Saxon mentality has been prone to apply the *leyenda negra* to Spaniards and people of the Latin races in general.

Hitler and his prophets have embellished and enriched the ideology of anti-Semitism by skillful manipulation

\* 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago 5, Ill., March-April, 1944.

of the Racist idea, which has its peculiar appeal to a materialist generation ready to interpret human things in the light of immediate impressions and sensations. He has been further aided by his appeal to Hegelian historic dynamism, so that the Jews are represented as a cause of all the social ills of the world and likewise as obstructing the cleansing and ennobling processes of history.

Where the racist idea takes root, as it does with certain segments of our American population, this particular philosophy of anti-Semitism finds a readier entrance. But nevertheless, the basic mark of anti-Semitism remains the notion of an historical scapegoat.

2. A *consistent* policy derived from these ideas. Such a policy denies to Jews the exercise of fundamental human rights, as citizens, and as human beings, *because* of the aforesaid belief in their essential harmfulness to society.

3. The third element, which seems to be inseparable from genuine anti-Semitism, is the *active propagation* of these ideas and furthering of these policies. Anti-Semitism is essentially a movement, not a mere philosophy.

In view of this distinctive character of anti-Semitism, as a body of ideas and as a movement, it would seem to be impractical to ascribe it solely to vulgar racial prejudice—although vulgar prejudice is an aider and abetter of the anti-Semitic movement. Nor can it be ascribed merely to religious differences, no matter how profound.

Like all things expressed in human language, such differences can be distorted into an excuse for anti-social conflict which of themselves the differences in no manner warrant.

#### EDUCATION OF THE PUBLIC

Nothing can excuse a thing intrinsically wrong and hateful—but there is a certain explanation or occasion for anti-Semitism in the fact of the mysteriousness of the Jewish people: the inexplicability, by any commonly known historic standards or ethnological analysis, of their continued existence, as a people, over many thousands of years; their sense of unity and fellowship despite all differences of culture, language, social condition and individual beliefs. In the thoughtful and humble mind such a phenomenon inspires wonder and reverence, a sense of the Providence of God working out its plan through the ages with the Jewish people as with the rest of the world. But upon the sensual, the proud, the egotistic or the irreligious mind, the same phenomenon may produce a quite contrary effect, and rise to a resentment, which seeks to rationalize itself through a fantastic theory.

The practical problem offered by *anti-Jewish prejudice* is challenging, but it is largely akin to the problem presented by other forms of inter-group or inter-cultural antagonisms. Its remedy is found in the use of the same methods and techniques which apply in these other instances. These

will obviously include: the education of the public in a sound philosophy of human rights; replacing misinformation with the truth about the respective minority group; building up the religious and moral vigor of the minority element itself, thereby increasing its own social adaptability; the enactment and wise observance of impartial, deterrent laws against discrimination, without placing an undue reliance upon the same. These, and all other matters that help to confirm sound relationships in the community and to establish moral and healthful contacts, will aid in the elimination of anti-Jewish prejudice in the future as they have helped towards its elimination in the past.

All attempts to deal with *anti-Semitism*, however, are bound to fall short if they underestimate the psychological appeal and attractiveness of this ideology. Anti-Semitism offers to the human mind and emotions three very engaging things.

First, it offers a tremendous *emotional release*. This is particularly dangerous in a time like ours, when normal, healthy emotions are frequently stunted by the demoralization of family life, the drabness of an industrialized existence and the tendency to seek ever greater and greater excitement. Social psychologists have observed that one of the main contributing causes to the terrible lynching evil is the quest of excitement in the emotionally starved communities of our Tobacco Road countrysides and villages. Anti-

Semitism gives people such excitement, in a strong and heady dose. Furthermore, the campaign of *combating anti-Semitism*, the emotional anti-hate movement, provides also a type of excitement which is skilfully utilized by exploiters of the popular passions, and publishers of some of our supposedly anti-hate dailies.

Secondly, anti-Semitism offers a certain *intellectual* satisfaction. The modern mind is bewildered and confused by the terrible complexity of history and contemporary events. But the doctrine of the genuine anti-Semites offers to the inquirer a simple explanation of the structure of history. History is seen to be a conflict of the bulk of the human race with the Jews. All history's mysterious movements, its curious contradictions and vagaries, can be unraveled without let or trouble by the simple process of throwing all blame upon the Jew. Furthermore, small and immediate annoyances are explained in this way. We "know" why the OPA bites, why taxes are high, etc.

Finally, anti-Semitism provides in a distorted fashion, a *substitute* for religion itself. It has its own doctrines and codes of conduct, its own mysticism, in common with other revolutionary movements.

Anti-Semitism, therefore, can only be dealt with by a program which counters it thoroughly and effectively on these three points.

Indirectly, anti-Semitism is combated by providing for our youth a

normal, emotionally healthy and non-frustrated life, which is another way of saying that anti-Semitism is a punishment of the community or nation, or of other nations for permitting the same, for the growth of unemployment, frustration, and personal demoralization. Mere economic reform, however important, is not sufficient to remedy this condition. The roots of anti-Semitism are found, too, in the disordered condition of the home, in the lowering of moral standards and a perverted sense of values.

Directly, an intellectual exposure of anti-Semitism should not be neglected. Mere denunciations of anti-Semitism, however, are apt to produce an effect contrary to that which is desired. They create an atmosphere of unreality, and are often in contradiction with petty human weaknesses that are daily observed.

#### RELIGION IS REMEDY

As an essentially anti-religious movement, however, its most specific remedy is to be found in religion itself. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with an integral version of Christian teaching. Indeed, as the development of the Hitler movement has abundantly shown, anti-Semitism is finally unmasked as a subtle attack upon Christianity quite as much as upon

Judaism. This has been brought out with emphatic repetition and great clearness by the authorized teachers of the Catholic Church as well as by a great number of non-Catholic theologians and philosophers since the advent of the Hitler regime. Hence, I see as the most complete and effective remedy for anti-Semitism the widespread understanding and the practical application of the Christian teaching, first, with regard to men in general, in the matter of human worth; secondly, the genuine Christian teaching as regards the historic dignity of the Jewish people themselves and the Jewish heritage of Christianity.

Speaking from the inter-cultural standpoint I believe the task in our local communities is twofold:

First, to do all we can, by well recognized inter-cultural techniques, to eliminate *anti-Jewish prejudice*, as the breeding ground and likewise the spawn of anti-Semitism.

Secondly, to warn all concerned, Jews and non-Jews alike, against a false and facile optimism with regard to anti-Semitism, as we should likewise warn against an equally false and dangerous pessimism in its regard. It can be cured, it can be prevented. But its roots are deeper than may at first sight appear.

# The Catastrophe of France

JOHN C. REID, M.A.

Reprinted from THE NEW ZEALAND TABLET\*

THE terrific disaster of the fall of France has led to endless speculations, many of them inevitably with a great deal of after-event wisdom in them, as to the fundamental causes of the catastrophe. Although, in the face of the rapidity of recent events, the French collapse seems now almost to belong to a previous period of history, the analysis of the tragedy is still a most important topic not only to those who love France, but to all who realize the part the restored nation must play in the future of Europe. The unique position that France has occupied in the past in the intellectual and cultural life of the Continent lends force to the idea that, in the process of uncovering the deeper causes of the greatest disaster in her history, we may light upon factors of decay which, while common to European thought in general, in France assumed clearer and more definite characteristics.

The various schools of thought which find the basic causes in economic or political considerations recognize this. Left-wing theorists place the emphasis upon the industrialists' "fear of Communism," and the "pro-Fascist mentality." Ultra-conservatives blame the Popular Front government's policy and the "Communist moral sabotage" following the Nazi-Soviet pact,

both developing analyses intimately related to their particular visions of post-war Europe. There are the more immediate views as well, ranging from Petain's cry "We had too few babies," and Giraud's description of the moral and spiritual decay of France to the de Gaullists' attacks on military unpreparedness and Vichy defeatism.

More recently, however, there have appeared significant discussions by important French writers which pass beyond political and economic considerations to the spiritual bases of not only French life and culture, but those of Europe as a whole. In general, these writings constitute a strong reaction against the mentality that led to defeat, and, further, emphasize the point that in seeking to restore herself, France need not seek solutions alien to her genius. Henri Bordeaux in *Les Murs sont Bons* expresses his faith in the ability of France to rise from the abyss through the strength of her old traditions. The volcanic Georges Bernanos in his *Lettre aux Anglais*, demands that France return to a heroic Christianity, for which he believes the elements are ready. He draws attention to the two absolutes of honor and sainthood, seeing a symbol of France today in the peasant and

\* P.O. Box 353, Dunedin, New Zealand, October 6, 1943.



saint, Joan of Arc, who was also inveigled into recantation and surrender by the casuists of her day.

Jacques Maritain has written much on the spiritual significance of the defeat, and has, like Bernanos, pointed to the power in the depths of France's soul ready for awakening. Finally, Henri Massis, who in *La Guerre de Trente Ans*, published just before the war, wrote a brilliantly discerning study of France's peril, has recently in *Les Idées Restent* summed up the ideas of this group by asserting that "the reconstruction of the French nation must keep to the lines which conform to the historical traits of the nation and the traditional spiritual values which France is called upon to carry on."

#### SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION

The keynote of their conclusions is revolution, but not so much a political revolution as a spiritual and a moral renewal, the same revolution of which Charles Peguy dreamed. In Peguy's case, the reality all but broke his spirit, but writers like Massis and Bernanos are very well aware of the chances that the revolution for which they hope will not take a Christian form. Thus they are concerned not to preach platitudes, but to locate the core of the spiritual rot in French life, to analyze the failure of French thinking which made defeat possible and by isolating the factors of disintegration, to teach Frenchmen to avoid them in the future.

It is worthy of note that most of the writers who concern themselves with the cultural origins of the French defeat are of the conviction that a great deal of the blame must be taken by French writers, themselves not wholly excepted. Again and again, their discussions come back to the question of the responsibility of those authors who helped to mould French thought in pre-war days. It is not suggested that the writers were the whole cause of the spiritual and mental decay, but merely that insofar as they codified, supported and popularized destructive tendencies they must share a large part of the blame. If Voltaire and Rousseau may be credited with playing an important role in preparing the minds of the French people for the Revolution, then many of the most prominent French authors of the twentieth century played no less important a role in creating the mentality and atmosphere favorable to defeat. Massis, for instance, says that one of the chief reasons for France's spiritual sickness was that "those whose duty it was to educate the public spirit, to enlighten it, to form it, had lost the feeling of responsibility." Let us see how far this may be true.

The confusion in the French spirit, the mental apathy and indecision so clearly revealed in Saint-Exupéry's *Flight to Arras* was the result largely of a depreciation of precise thinking, the very virtue for which the French are justly noted. This depreciation rendered possible a dishon-

esty in words, a betrayal of the spirit by the language which is at the root of the sapless literature of pre-war days. It is not easy to name any precise point to which one might trace the origin of this vagueness and confusion of perceptions. Dr. Mario Praz in his *Romantic Agony* leaves us in no doubt as to the decadent atmosphere in which the neo-Romantic impulses were working themselves out at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the twentieth. There is indeed today a tendency to trace the perverse pessimism of modern literature, the retreat from reason which is ending in the cul-de-sac of Surrealism, to Baudelaire and Rimbaud. But the decay of the word, which is symptomatic of a shattering of the balance between thought and feeling, has roots deep in the Renaissance itself. The Renaissance and its product, the Reformation, inaugurated through its destruction of a common faith the reign of the isolated individual whose sole authority was his own experience.

The early Renaissance, indeed, with its efflorescence of art fostered a profound subjective feeling for beauty, but to this same subjective spirit with its self-regard was added the reflex egoism of sectarian authority. Underlying the medieval world was the central idea of *being* and its confidence in the findings of the common consciousness. With the Renaissance this disappeared, to be replaced by the various idealist systems which postulated an antithesis between idea and reality,

and asserted that there could be no conceptual knowledge of the real. If this is so, then the sole reality must be individual experience. This is the only thing of which a man can be certain, and from which all his speculations must proceed.

Later, the influential theories of Kant unconsciously strengthened the subjectivist spirit. That Kant could see beyond his own subjectivist premises is evident in his *Practical Reason*, but the broad effect of the argument which this work propounds for the subjective origin of religion and ethics was a strengthening of the anthropocentric spirit. This manifested itself later in the modernist movement which attempted to demonstrate that all Christian truth is simply external symbolism of personal religious experience.

From the esthetic humanism of the Renaissance, through the over-emphasis upon personal religious experience which the Reformation fostered, and which was confirmed by the philosophy of Kant, we come to the supremely subjectivist movement, the Romantic movement, the creation chiefly of the arch-neurotic Rousseau. One of the more immediate effects of this movement was the creation of its own autonomous world in literature, a world which manufactured its own law, depended upon no imperative other than that of individual emotion and carried within itself immediately apparent the seed of anarchy.

At first, the liberation of the individual consciousness resulted in that

upsurge of artistic production which usually accompanies the initial enthusiasm of revolutions. The lyrical instinct was given free play, and a superb literary flowering followed. But even in the very beginnings, in Chateaubriand, with his mingling of the erotic and the religious, in Hugo, with his love of the grotesque, there are manifest these elements of perversion, the fascinations of the abyss, which were to develop into the orgy of eroticism, obscurity and sterile psychologizing of the later nineteenth century and our own day.

#### HALF TRUTHS

Baudelaire with his preoccupation with the flowers of evil, his exploration of the abnormal and the diseased, his distillation of the poison of an age, and later Rimbaud, with his systematic pursuit of disorder, and his calculated "derangement of the senses," set the fashion for the newer conscious search for half-truths and the plumbing of the darkest depths of the human spirit. From this, it is true, the astonishing Rimbaud later recoiled. But even that exaggerated realism of Zola and the Goncourts against which Rimbaud revolted was as far away from truth as Rimbaud's dream world and led to the same result of an imperfect and often falsified picture of human reality.

In our day, the old emotional humanism of the Renaissance and the philosophical humanism of the 18th century have given way to a psycho-

logical humanism which is mechanistic and materialistic. Recently, due largely to a reaction against totalitarian philosophies, this newer humanism has become somewhat less mechanistic. However, in literature, psychological research has become a dilettante pursuit, "psychologism." Massis points out that Pascal has shown that it was possible to go as far as one wished in the research of human nature without damaging the concept of personality. But it is precisely the discarding of the concept of human personality which is characteristic of modern French writing.

Stendhal, rather than Flaubert, is the forerunner of the modern psychological novel. But there is in Stendhal, for all his insight and artistry, the absence of a coherent vision of life which leads him to exclude from his work immense areas of experience. Jacques Riviere, comparing Stendhal and Dostoevsky, says of Stendhal's characters "They are all marvelously light, active, clear-cut. They are *individuals* but not creatures. They are nothing but the sum of their passions. They are exactly what they feel and nothing beyond. In the last resort their souls might have been composed by chemical forces sublimated to the nth degree." The fact that the novelist considers it inadmissible to judge his characters in the light of moral standards, or even to admit the substantial reality of these standards has meant an analysis of the human person for its own sake which has led to the dis-

astrous dissolution of personality.

The failure of the human spirit in our time must be largely due to the fact that the soul can no longer believe in its integrity. The "psychologism" which, with its probings, can find nothing but failures, rupture, obscurity, has passed over the universal texture from which individuals are shaped, and the individual, presented with the pieces, has no pattern with which to remake the whole.

The most typical influence which leads to this result is that of Andre Gide. At first sight, the severe classicism of his forms may seem to exclude any anarchical quality from Gide's work, but the cultivation of this style is due chiefly to the instinctive desire of his nature to communicate itself only with the maximum of reserve. Actually, Gide accepts the classical forms with its restrictions because for him it is the best instrument of his onslaught against the ideal which is the aim of this form.

#### HIS "FRANKNESS"

It is difficult to treat Gide simply as a literary phenomenon. His case goes beyond the limits of literary analysis into the realms of pathology. Du Bos, his most understanding critic, Francois Mauriac, Daniel-Rops and Massis find it necessary to judge him in the light of supreme moral and aesthetic values. His tremendous influence on the younger generation of French authors, on such important critics as Jacques Riviere, on English writers

such as E. M. Forster, and his superb artistry and intelligence made "gicism" the most potent force in pre-war French letters.

What is the basis of Gide's esthetic? He does not merely place art on an equality with life, for in his eyes, art is the supreme value. "Ethics is an annex of esthetics." This does not mean that he ignores religious and moral considerations. On the contrary, *L'Immoraliste*, *La Symphonie Pastorale* and that cunning gibe at piety *L'Ecole des Femmes* and *Robert* all reveal an intense interest in moral problems, while the basis of his masterpiece *Les Faux Monnayeurs* is a neo-Manichaeism, reanimated by the spirits of Nietzsche and the Divine Marquis. As one of his characters says at the end of the novel: "The devil and God are one and the same; they work together. Cruelty, that's the principal attribute of God." However, much of the misunderstanding which the apparent devotion and piety of some of his novels arouses, arises from not realizing that Gide is interested in moral and religious questions merely as material for his books. He claims the right to experience and record everything possible to human beings, no matter how contradictory these experiences may be, to obtain artistic material anywhere and everywhere. Religious sentiment and a moral sense are recognized phenomena of the human spirit and so provide material for Gide in the same way as do homosexuality, and skepticism.

The sole value which he allows is "frankness." This basic literary virtue of today owes a great deal to Gide, who smoothed the way for its triumphal progress. His ideal of frankness is achieved by throwing overboard the conception that life shall be subject to any kind of control, and thus in the abandonment of the domination of an ethical system, all ideas and attitudes have equal value and acquire a significance only in so far as they are employed as artistic material. To Gide this process is a "depersonalization," a self-abnegation. And in this depersonalization is implicit the idea that nature in all its aspects, even in its most perverse and distorted forms, is above all moral restraints.

#### LOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Gide's doctrine is summed up in his own words: "Whether a man is licentious or not does not matter; what matters is whether he has the right to be so. And this right art must uphold at all costs." His entire artistic life has been devoted to the cultivation of an art which in the purest classical form attacks the whole concept of personality and which regards itself as an instrument which, in the destruction of the integral man of Christianity and the freeing of hitherto restrained impulses in the human spirit, will produce a different sort of human being.

The enormous fascination Gide has exercised over literary France is the result of the attraction of his

classical style. But this, however much he speaks of "frankness," is a falsification. For the naturally constructive force of the classical form is made by Gide to foster tendencies which he himself acknowledges as destructive. He has developed the Romantic conception to its logical conclusion in liberating the anarchical universe of the passions from the controlling laws of the spirit, and in giving these passions autonomy. Thus he strikes at the whole Christian idea of man, and would abolish all these things which mark out the *person* from the *individual*. And as he has an ineradicable nostalgia for religious values, he eternally seeks self-justification, becoming a spiritual outcast who wanders from Christianity to demonism, from pietism to Communism, from ascetism to sadism, and now into the great Nowhere.

#### A DEFEATIST WORLD

The novels of Gide do not reveal his spiritual tragedy as clearly as do his confessions, but in the huge novel of Marcel Proust may be clearly seen the chaos of the "liberated" world of Gide, the *reductio ad absurdum* of "psychologism." From the musty memories of Proust, with their damp odor of the tomb, emerges a new world for which Gide seeks, a world which is decaying, an autonomous world peopled with the fragments of depersonalized man. It is, as Massis puts it, a world of "seclusion and fear of living."

Here in *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu* is a rendering of an interior life divorced from intelligence, a complete surrender to the arbitrary whim of the subconscious. It is a wholly emotional life regulated only by memory and not amenable to the laws of logic or rational ethics. "My book," Proust said, "is in no manner a work of the reason; the smallest elements in it have been furnished by my sensibility. This tremendous attempt to isolate the invisible substance of Time is the grave of Romanticism. The disclaiming of the reason takes us a step further in the rejection of the integral man. It is a dissection which annihilates, by denying the spiritual bond between the passions and the intellect. Proust's world is a defeatist world. His tragedy is that, while striving to make Time incarnate and thus to recover a lost universe, his aim burrows deeper and deeper in upon itself. He takes himself apart in his search, but he has no power of reintegration, and thus personality has evaporated from his world. He has abandoned himself to impulses and these have betrayed him.

#### PAUL VALÉRY

Much the same is evident in the work of Paul Valéry, possibly the most impressive poetic figure of our day. In the world from which Valéry draws his ideas, logic has no more importance than it had in the world of Proust, or in the world of Rimbaud. His vision also is not integral. Form

is separated from thought, and every individual "impression" has its own validity. "Everything exists; nothing has value."

As with Gide, Valéry has achieved a classical perfection of form. He is fundamentally an intellectual writer, but he is enchanted by movement for its own sake; he seeks the law of continuity, a world consisting of connections indeed, for thus must the impressions be linked, but the sum of these connections aimless and self-sufficient. In his work, form becomes its own justification and end, and lives an almost independent life, sustained not by its integral relationship with thought, but by its studied harmonies from music and mathematics. Valéry aimed to possess "tout ce qui est possible," to construct in his verse a complete system absorbing other intelligences, but he has been led to a sterility of inspiration which is terrifying in its implications. Unlike Claudel, who is his co-heir of the Symbolists, Valéry's work is without either the apprehension or acceptance of life as a whole. Claudel's *Odes* constitute, as Riviere says, "an immense act of thanksgiving" so that, while his words, like Valéry's, have light and sound, they also have an odor and taste. But in Valéry there is an acceptance of relationships which merely emphasizes the particularity of the impressions and the lack of coherence, organic unity and aim.

In opposition to all these tendencies, there looms the figure of Charles

Peguy. It is significant that recently there has been a great renewal of interest in his curious personality. A socialist finding in Catholicism the fulfilment of Socialism, a believer with so much respect for the individual conscience that he would not persuade his wife to obtain the blessing of the Church on their union, a passionate lover of humanity who suffered agonies of soul over the doctrine of hell, a powerful prophet and tireless worker for the poor, the hero who died magnificently in a war which was to be "the last of all wars," Peguy is today coming to assume something of the significance which is really his. For this is the integral man.

This tireless warrior for ideas, who poured out his convictions in the packed pages of his *Cahiers de la Quinzaine*, was also a man of profound contemplation, for whom ideas were no intellectual diversion, but represented the essence of reality. He attacked unceasingly the "capitalistes d'hommes," such as Blum, Herr and Jaures, those who manipulated the lives of men as dishonest speculators manipulate money. Yet he was not anti-intellectual. His was an anti-rationalism, an attitude of mind which tested experiences with the criteria of the heart as well as of the intelligence.

When a metaphysic and a religion, when a philosophy vanishes from mankind, it is equally true, if not truer, to say that mankind has vanished from that metaphysic and that religion, from that philosophy. An intellect which is beginning to outgrow a philosophy is simply a soul

which is ceasing to be in harmony with its tone and rhythm, its speech and its echoes. When we have lost this harmony we say that we are beginning to feel emancipated.

To Peguy mysticism meant the spiritual tension in every heroic human being. His whole life was inspired by the subject of his great drama *Jeanne d'Arc*. For him the saint was the symbol of the union of the spiritual and the temporal. In the temporal she represented what he loved most, the poor people, his country. In the spiritual, she incarnates the virtues he chiefly prized, faith, heroism, universal love. As with Bernanos, Joan of Arc was to Peguy a symbol of France and the "honor" which Riviere opposes to the "frankness" of Gide. Thus he dreamed, as a Socialist and later as a Catholic, of uniting men under Joan's banner in a complete social comradeship. Life had no significance if there was not community.

#### UNTIRING WAR

To the introspective probings of the Romantics, Peguy opposed the idea of fellowship, at the basis of which is the conception of the whole man, the integral man, which shatters the false duality of knowledge and action. "We are real beings. We are poor, exceedingly poor. But our humanity, our essential humanity must not be confused with the unfortunate parts we play."

Peguy's untiring war against the "capitalistes d'hommes" and against soulless intellectuality has a particular significance today, now that his be-



loved country has been brought low largely because of the triumph of those ideas he abhorred. His fame has been slow in maturing. Like a true peasant he believed in things being done slowly and carefully, and the field he ploughed was ploughed deep. He was the champion of a sane life, a traditional life, a life rooted deep in the people. He foresaw almost in detail the onslaught of modern barbarism and against it, in drama, in prose, in verse, he erected the conception in which he believed so deeply, a community of Christian men.

The chaos of today stands gravely in need of the regulating truth which Peguy preached, a true spirituality which consists of a vital and organic connection between natural and divine order, a spirituality in which thought and feeling, and after that, thought and action proceed in the same direction. The important message he has for France and indeed for the Western world is that only the integral human personality, that personality attacked and destroyed by so many writers of our times, can serve as a basis for a real human community.

In the community in which Peguy would have a reborn France take her place, truth, justice and right are values which have their origin in the Absolute, and the community not only has its source in God, but leads back to Him. Viewed in this light, "Civilization is a rough sketch of, or the first step towards, perfect order." This is a Christian conception and insofar as it refers specifically to France it means that only upon an acceptance of the truth of ideas which are the traditional spiritual heritage of Europe can the foundations of the new civilization be laid.

It remains to be seen which idea will prevail, the anarchism of "depersonalization" which would create a new man by liberating all the dark passions of the soul, all the unruly instincts which Christianity had subdued, or the dynamism of the centered man, where the eternal enters into the temporal and the whole of action and thought proceed from the substance of life itself. For through the triumph of one of these France and with her, Europe, will either be damned or will gloriously regain her soul.



### *Vocation of France*

France's vocation is primarily spiritual; but political as well, because just as politics divorced from morals are the cause of the world's crisis, so must politics inspired by spirituality be the means of its reconversion. France's destiny will be fulfilled in her opposition to just that materialistic ideology which caused her fall and would keep her dependent.—C. J. Woollen in *The WEEKLY REVIEW*, London, England, February 3, 1944.



## Pesch and Christian Solidarism

JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER, S.J.

Reprinted from *The HISTORICAL BULLETIN*\*

LEO XIII, the Pope of *Rerum Novarum*, once hailed Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler of Mainz in Germany as "my great predecessor." Pius XI, Pope of *Quadragesimo Anno*, could have used similar words in referring to Father Heinrich Pesch, S.J. For Father Pesch, originator of the social philosophy and political economy called Christian Solidarism, developed a system for social reorganization which was to form the basis of Pius' great Encyclical, that Magna Charta of modern social reform. Father Pesch was the first to achieve, as the result of an entire life's dedication to the task, an organized system of social teaching based on Christian philosophy and incorporating the best of modern economic science. His doctrine is found in the five volumes of his *Das Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*, published from 1904 to 1923, which Rudolf Obermeier is pleased to call a "Summa."

To understand Pesch's place in history, we must first have at least a general notion of the social history of the past century and a half. The intellectual individualism of the Renaissance had already begotten religious, moral and, to a certain degree, cultural individualism. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, accompanied by the Industrial Revolution, it made

a raid of unprecedented violence and success into the field of economics. To the historian the Industrial Revolution makes familiar reading. To the student of social history the movement represents an era when individualism gave to the world simultaneously an undreamed of prosperity and an abyss of social misery; a battalion of *nouveaux riches* and an army of exploited poor; the comforts of the wealthy and the sixteen-hour working day for ten-year-olds in the mining pits. That was the time when Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was accepted as the bible of economics, and his successors, J. B. Say, Malthus, Ricardo, the Mills, and their followers were venerated as the prophets of economy.

The exploitation of the masses, however, and the frequent recurrence of that shocking paradox of poverty amid a world of plenty were bound to produce a reaction. They did; and like most reactions, this one represented an extreme. Simonde de Sismondi, historian and at first a disciple of Smith, came to deny Smith's hypothesis that a nation's wealth is equal to the sum of its individuals' wealth. He claimed that national prosperity is measured by national enjoyment. He denounced laissez-faire, and demanded for the poor a greater share in this world's goods. The case against individualis-

\* St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo., March, 1944.

tic capitalism was further advanced by Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc, and others in France; by Ferdinand Lassalle and Karl Rodbertus in Germany. Hence, when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels published in 1847 their formal declaration of war against capitalism in the *Communist Manifesto*, their act was the culmination of several decades of introductory opposition to liberal economics. It was also the beginning of modern collectivism in its many forms. A war was then begun between the adherents of individualism and collectivism, the decisive completion of which is awaited by the world today with trepidation, no matter which side prevails.

#### CHRISTIAN SOCIAL REFORM

But what of the social leaders of Christianity during that time? The heroic tales of a Villeneuve-Bargemont, Comte le Mun and Ozanam in France; of a Baron von Vogelsang and later Karl Leuger in Austria; of a baron and bishop in Germany, Wilhelm von Ketteler, are the answer. When Ketteler delivered his six fiery sermons on the social questions of the day in the cathedral of Mainz in 1848, those Christians who acknowledged the intrinsic evils of individualistic capitalism as well as the equally untenable and even more vicious hypotheses of materialistic collectivism had the basis for a middle-way program of their own. Ketteler became a byword for the Christian Social Reform movement even beyond the frontiers of his

native Germany, and a tower of strength in the raging social battles of the day. The efforts of Ketteler and his compatriots in many countries, especially in England and in France, were the first skirmishes which set the stage for Pope Leo's Encyclical of 1891. P. T. Moon, in *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France*, recalls the inspiration Ketteler gave to organizations among French Catholics, and Karl Waniger, in *Social Catholicism in England*, traces the influence of Ketteler on the organizations in England.

But the progress of the Christian middle way was not sufficient. Definitely it was the middle way between an individualism which had conveniently managed to divorce economics from morality, and a collectivism which simply denied morality in the face of evolutionistic materialism. After the revolt of Marx, the masses were thirsting more and more for some sort of social justice. Although the Christian movement did produce great thinkers like Hitze, Hertling and Pieper, still there was no standard work which would give a definitive answer to the questions of modern sociology from the Christian point of view.

It was here that Father Pesch made his entrance into the field of social problems. His system of Christian Solidarism gave a philosophic foundation from which to attack both the individualism and the collectivism of the age. He maintained that human soci-

ety is composed of individuals necessarily bound to each other by ties of both justice and charity, assistance and dependence, but in such a way that their own personal rights and responsibilities remain. Solidarism is not expressed by the individualist's slogan, "all for me," nor by the collectivist's slogan, "all for the state, society, or race"; solidarism is rather expressed by social justice's slogan "all for one, one for all." This includes all phases of human life under the laws of morality, and neither excludes economics as does the economic liberalist, nor denies the moral law as does the materialistic collectivist.

Heinrich Pesch, the son of a tailor, was born on September 17, 1854, in Cologne. Growing up in the midst of the social upheavals of his time, young Pesch went to Bonn University where he made his legal and socio-political studies under two great men, G. V. Hertling, leading Catholic philosopher, and E. Nasse, a sharp economist. In 1876, when the Catholic Social Movement of the Rhineland was gaining ground under Ketteler, Pesch entered the Society of Jesus.

Bismarck's *Kulturkampf* was of course unfavorable to the Jesuits, and as a result Pesch and his brethren were transferred for four years to the Jesuit house of studies at Ditton Hall in Lancashire, England, to continue their studies. The horrible social conditions of industrial life in this locality permanently influenced him. He decided to dedicate his life to the

"welfare of the people, down to the lowest strata." Now he began his study towards a solution for modern social problems, especially those in the field of labor.

An examination of Pesch's three basic tenets will show how strongly his Lancashire experiences influenced him in taking up the cause of the common man. First, he tells us, *man* is the lord of the world; that lordship is not held either by the state or by an impersonal god called profit. Secondly, not any man, but the *laboring* man is the lord of the world; for labor is a duty and a right—hence it is not the mark of a lowly class. Thirdly, not man laboring in self-sufficiency, but man as *laboring in society* is lord of the world. Hence, solidarism is a social labor system (*soziales Arbeitssystem*), and consequently, is opposed to rugged individualism. It requires not the socialization of property, but the humane socialization of men's minds and hearts through social justice and charity.

#### BIRTH OF CHRISTIAN SOLIDARISM

Ordained to the priesthood in 1888, Father Pesch accepted the invitation of Count Sylva Tarouca to spend some time in the latter's Türmitz castle in northern Bohemia. The Count had arranged a series of lectures to be given by Rudolph Meier on the emancipation of the fourth estate. Although Pesch emphatically disagreed with Meier's socialism, yet the future founder of Christian Solidarism did

get a new insight into the object of his studies. Subsequent articles show that much of Pesch's doctrine on the rural question and on the necessary concord between farm and city classes may be traced back to the conferences and lectures of Meier.

In 1892 Pesch began his eight years' stay at the diocesan seminary at Mainz as spiritual prefect. Spiritual directorship was, however, but a portion of his activities. In constant contact with Bishop Haffner, the Jesuit derived much help and inspiration. In gratitude, Pesch later dedicated the first volume of the *Lehrbuch* to the Bishop's memory. During this time Pesch was also in frequent touch with the leaders of the Center Party, with members of the French *Semaines-Sociales*, and with representatives of the *Munchen-Goldbach Verein*.

It will be remembered that the Center Party at this time was legislating many of the social reforms advocated previously by Ketteler. There is of course much similarity between Pesch's theory of the place of the state in human life, and that upheld by the Center Party's program. The state is governed by the principle of subsidiarity. This means that private liberty and autonomy are the motivating principles of all individual and group activity, unless they actually need state help or direction. This position is evidently opposed to both the laissez-faire of individualism, and the absolute rule of totalitarianism. In many respects subsidiarity was the

spirit behind the legislative reforms of the period.

It was at the Seminary of Mainz, in the very house where Ketteler had lived and worked, that Pesch wrote his initial major work, two volumes on social philosophy, *Liberalismus, Sozialismus, und christliche Gesellschaftsordnung*. It was first published in 1896, and contained all the fundamental ideas of his later work.

Pesch's sincerity and thoroughness were shown in 1901 when, as a man close to fifty years of age, he again went to school. For three years he sat with the pupils of the leading economists of the day at Berlin, and studied the lectures of the so-called "Socialists of the Chair," men like Wagner, Sering and Schmoller. Owing to his relations with Wagner, Pesch was able to construct more certainly the systematic middle way of solidarism.

In 1904 Pesch moved to the Jesuit college in Luxembourg to begin his masterpiece. On December 8 of that year, appeared the first volume of *Das Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*. Despite frequent interruptions caused by illness, he produced the other four volumes at intervals. The last appeared in April, 1923. In 1910 he was transferred to Marienfeld, near Berlin, where he accomplished most of his work. He achieved his goal of producing a standard work on Christian social philosophy and political economy which measured up to the highest scientific, philosophic standards.

In testimony of his singular contribution to Christian and scientific progress, the University of Cologne awarded Pesch an honorary degree in political science and the University of Münster awarded him an honorary doctorate in theology. Of more significance to Pesch, to culture and to history was the fact that he was acknowledged in secular as well as in Christian circles as the founder of a school. This is what Dr. Ernst Winter had in mind when he stated that the name of Pesch stands for a program in national life.

Pesch died at Ignatiuskolleg, Valkenburg in Holland, on April 1, 1926. Dr. Lechtape wrote of him in the *Staatslexikon* that he had harmonized in his person the most exemplary qualities of a priest, a gentleman and a scientist.

#### INFLUENCE AND SUCCESSORS

But just what effect did his work have? Certainly conditions were not too propitious for a mass following of his leadership. The decade succeeding World War I was, in the main, one of unprecedented prosperity, and hence men did not consider that there was need of rectifying our socio-economic processes. In the world of thinkers, however, the name of Pesch stood for a program of genuine social betterment. He had shaped Christian scientific thought, so that it was no longer backward in the treatment of social economics. Lechtape in the *Allgemeine Rundschau* is very decisive on

that point. He says: "Precisely therein lies the great significance of Pesch's national economy. Here for the first time was a work produced from the Catholic viewpoint which could take its place equally alongside the best works in the science of national economy. It signified a positive enriching of science."

An examination of the literature and periodicals, mostly of Germany and Austria, for the past half century will show the striking attention given both to Pesch's own writings and to commentaries. A fact of greater significance is that several men closely associated with Pesch, either as disciples or as colleagues, were of undoubted assistance in the construction of some of the basic formulae used in the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. Since a formidable part of the world is striving to reform social life according to the principles enunciated in that doctrine, namely to discover a middle road between totalitarianism and individualism, the work of Pesch still lives. Austria under Dollfuss, Portugal under Salazar, and the new code of economic democracy in Costa Rica are salient examples of nations whose recent developments have been influenced admittedly and significantly by the papal program.

It is beyond the scope of this article to say more of the principles of solidarism. A study of the system will reveal to the student its application to class relations, to citizenship and to the relations between trades. Funda-

mental differences from capitalism and collectivism will be more patent. Corporative organizations and sympathetic employer-employee relations will be seen as integral parts of the system.

Father Pesch's successors in the field of solidarism are chiefly Fathers Oswald V. Nell-Breuning, S.J., and Gustav Gundlach, S.J. Both have written on the subject. One notes especially the latter's articles, "Solidarism" in the *Staatslexicon* and "Solidarismus, Einzelmensch, Gemeinschaft" in *Gregorianum* Vol. xxvii, as admirable syntheses of the system. In this country, Dr. Franz Mueller, at present professor of economics at St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minnesota, was long associated with Pesch in Germany, and is one of the leading exponents of Pesch's system. The Central Bureau of the Central Verein in St. Louis, Missouri, under the directorship of Frederick Kenkel, has long been dedicated to the teachings of Pesch. In this organization's publication, formerly *Cen-*

*tralblatt and Social Justice* but now the *Social Justice Review*, the late Father William Engelen, S.J. and Father Charles Bruehl of Overbrook Seminary in Pennsylvania published many articles on solidarism. Father Bernard Dempsey, S.J., professor of economics of St. Louis University, and author of the well known and much used translation of Nell-Breuning's scholarly commentary on *Quadragesimo Anno*, is among the other American scholars who have studied Pesch's system; as are Dr. Alphonse Clemens, also of St. Louis University and Dr. Goetz Briefs of Georgetown.

Pesch's school has not made rapid progress. Nevertheless, just as history has been unable to overlook Adam Smith and Karl Marx, so too signs indicate that historians of the future will have much to do with the deeds of the school Pesch founded, a school which has chosen the middle path between the ruinous roads of Marx and Manchester.



### *Fertility in Rural and Urban Areas*

One of the interesting features revealed by statistics of some of the Western European countries for which statistics are available is that a lower level of fertility obtains in urban than in rural areas. The past half century indeed has witnessed the continual growth of population in urban areas at the expense of the higher fertility of rural districts.—H. I. Sinclair in the *New Zealand TABLET*, February 16, 1944.

# Swelling the Tide of Converts

ALBERT J. WILSON

Reprinted from COLUMBIA

LAST year's figure on converts to the Church was up 150 per cent over the figure for 1928. Some people think we should be reticent about this fact lest we stir up an invidious reaction on the part of non-Catholic sects. But why should we go pussy-footing around about plain facts? We're not proselyting. We're not stealing members from other communions. Nor are we high-pressuring anyone. We're conscious of the fact that 75,000,000 of our fellow Americans just don't go to any church at all—so we broadcast the truth about the Catholic Church, say our prayers and then sit back to watch developments.

Apart from Divine grace as the necessary cause of every conversion, we can say that the rapid rise has been due to a number of factors both within and without our control.

Father Richard Ginder relates the figure to economic and political developments as follows:

"Sixteen years ago," he writes in *Our Sunday Visitor*, "we received 35,751 souls. Last year we received 86,905. In 1928, at the peak of the boom, the number dropped from 35,751 to about 33,900. People were too well off to think about God. Came the crash in 1929, and the figure went up to 38,000 in 1930. It took three years for

people to soak themselves in the fact that we can't get along without God; then, between 1933 and 1934, the figure rose from 40,200 to 49,100, to 63,800 in 1935. The prosperity of the succeeding years leveled the figure off for a while until World War II began, reflected in a figure of 73,600 converts in 1940. Our entry into the war, and the attendant emotional agonies raised the total to a peak of 86,905 converts for 1943."

It throws light on the problem of evil by showing in a striking manner how God in His mysterious way draws good from national calamities.

## A CHANGE IN APPROACH

Other causes contributing to the increasing harvest of souls have been a change in our technique—in our approach to non-Catholics, that is—and the superb cooperation of the laity in Catholic Action.

The last generation of Catholics might have been described as militant, in a more or less aggressive sense. Every community was concentrated in little knots which kept pretty much to themselves: Catholics, Lutherans, the Reformed, Methodists, etc. The Lutherans considered the Methodists heretics, and the Methodists cordially reciprocated. There was no inter-faith

\* New Haven 7, Conn., March, 1944.

communion. Some of us can still remember how Dr. McGarvey split the Episcopalian Church wide open on the question of the open-pulpit, that is, on allowing non-Episcopalians to preach at Episcopalian services. Dr. McGarvey thought that was heresy, and he brought quite a number of fellow ministers into our Church on the head of it.

This attitude among Christians developed a trenchant kind of Catholic apologetics. There was very little written for outsiders, to begin with, and that little often started with the bald thesis: "You're all wrong and we're right. Now read this. . . ."

It was pure logic, with no concessions to non-Catholic sensibilities. The convert of the period before 1900, or even 1910, was a hardy soul indeed! One exception in this literature occurs to us, and that is Cardinal Gibbons' *The Faith of Our Fathers*, which was probably the first work on the American scene to drop the "Sir, you cur!" attitude.

Orestes Brownson saw the problem without being able to do much about it. In his autobiography, *The Convert*, he writes (p. 285):

"The argument of our theologians is scholastic, severe, and conclusive for the pure intellect that is in the condition to listen to it; but it seems to me better adapted, practically, to confirm believers and guard them against the specious objections of their enemies, than to convince unbelievers."

Again, he says (p. 291-2):

"The ordinary motives of credibility do not move non-Catholics to believe, because these motives start from principles which they do not accept, or accept with so much vagueness and uncertainty, that they do not serve to warrant assent even to the strictly logical conclusions drawn from them. Moreover, they do not reach their peculiar difficulties, do not touch their real objections; and though they seem overwhelming to Catholics, they leave all their objections remaining in full force, and their inability to believe undiminished."

In other words, we can establish the truth of our claims to an outsider, and he may crown our argument by saying: "Yes, but I like our hymns better than yours."—Or, he may say that none of the "better" people are Catholics.

We've come to the point of seeing that logic can't do it all. For purposes of conversion, it's important to prove that, for instance, our Holy Father is the successor of St. Peter as Head of the Church; but it's almost of equal importance to convince this particular individual that we have something to offer in place of his beloved hymns, and that he won't be ostracized by his social and business acquaintances.

There are two phases then: first, the developing of an appeal not only to the head, but to the heart as well; and then getting that message across to the public. It's a problem which



every American businessman will recognize immediately. It's advertising; and, saving God's intervention, it succeeds or fails according to the same rules which govern the success or failure of commercial advertising.

This work is being handled with considerable success by means of the press and the radio and, although there are no statistics, by word-of-mouth and inspiring example on the part of the Catholic laity—especially of the men and women in the service.

Low-cost pamphlets are being published, slanted at non-Catholics. These are neat little jobs, done on slick paper, with a human-interest photograph on the cover. The *Imprimatur* is omitted by permission. The largest house specializing in this work is The Catholic Information Society, at 214 West 31st Street, New York.

"If only we could educate our people to buy these leaflets, not for themselves, but for deposit on buses and in subways! If only they could learn to leave them lying around in stations or wherever people congregate with a few moments for reading! I've seen so many people pick our pamphlets off the rack and register disappointment on leafing over them. They're missing the point. The pamphlets are not for Catholics; they're for non-Catholics. But they won't reach non-Catholics unless it be through Catholic hands."

So says Father Bonaventure Fitzgerald, O.F.M., Cap., Director, the CIS.

The Narberth Apostolate is another potent force in this activity. Sponsored now by the National Council of Catholic Men in Washington, it feeds a weekly Catholic information column in 172 secular newspapers from coast to coast. This is an activity in which many Councils of the Knights have interested themselves with gratifying success. The insertion of a local column is remarkably simple and, of course, the apostolate pays dividends in one's own community through the fostering of a better understanding between Protestants and Catholics. N. C. C. M. has a booklet describing the whole setup for those who are interested.

#### KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

But the Knights of Columbus have always had what one might almost call a special devotion to the radio apostolate. Since 1930 the Supreme Council has contributed \$46,000 toward defraying the expenses of the Catholic Hour, produced by the National Council of Catholic Men in collaboration with N. B. C.

It is impossible to appraise the good being done. The fan mail of the speakers on the Catholic Hour is always large, but it is especially so when Monsignor Sheen is on the air. It fluctuates, of course, depending on the subjects of his talks, and the temper of the nation when he gives them. But even at its lightest, his mail isn't to be "sneezed at"; and it always brings a number of tributes from lis-

teners, accounts of conversions, cases of conscience and requests for copies of his sermons.

The mail which has been addressed to N. B. C. stations is bundled and sent to Washington every few days, as it accumulates. It is opened by discreet clerks at N. C. C. M. These sort out the routine matter, laying aside letters which might be of special interest to Monsignor Sheen or those which practically demand his personal attention.

But even the mail is hardly a fair index of audience reaction. Honestly, how often have you yourself been stirred to write in praise or disapproval of a radio talk? Mr. George Spelvin, the average American and the man we most want to reach, is just the man who isn't given to writing letters to editors or radio-speakers. He has his hands full writing once a week to that boy or girl of his in the service.

Until this fall, the National Broadcasting Company was the only national network carrying a Catholic program as a weekly feature. Columbia has its "Church of the Air" between 1 and 1:30 E. W. T., and Mutual has the "Radio Chapel" from 10:30 to 11, both on Sunday, but these rotate among Catholics and non-Catholics, the speakers being chosen by a mixed committee.

Last spring, the Blue Network asked the National Council of Catholic Men to sponsor a weekly program on their hookup. The time finally agreed on was the half hour on Sun-

days between 11:30 and 12 E. W. T. Naturally, neither the Blue Network nor the N. C. C. M. wanted a carbon-copy of the Catholic Hour. The project called for considerable thought.

Obviously, one of the features of the Hour would be the talks. But what kind of talks? How long should they be? It was finally decided that ten minutes ought to be the outside limit. Priests have a pulpit-maxim to the effect that—"Most souls are saved during the first ten minutes of a sermon." And a man can pack a lot of appeal into such a message. The hedging of time should make for clarity and conciseness.

These were not to be sermons. Theses were to be talks, chats, visits. The speaker would picture himself as having dropped into his listener's home late on a Sunday morning. He might catch his friend stretched out in an easy chair, with the Sunday paper strewn over the floor. There must be nothing controversial, nothing sensational; just an informative chat on how we Catholics look at things. One could practically see the smoke of smouldering tobacco, and sniff the aroma of the roast in the oven.

So much for the talk. But what to do with the rest of the time? Music, of course; but how?—what kind?

To fit the talks, the music should be easy to listen to. It should be devotional; the "Ave Maria's" of Gounod and Schubert, the "Panis Angelicus" of Cesar Franck, the "Adoration" by Borowski—these would just

about hit the stride. An organ would be necessary, and a violin and harp, to add a note of richness; a good male quartet could take care of the vocal numbers.

To be really up-to-date, to have unction, the program ought to follow the stream-of-consciousness idea, with music sounding even under the announcements. It would save the abruptness of stopping and starting between pieces and tend to bind the whole program into a unit.

Well, there you have it—The Hour of Faith! It's been on since last October, and it's running exactly according to plans. Practically all the reactions of listeners have so far been favorable. Some few persons have written in, scandalized at the apparent slight to the speaker implied in the ten-twenty ratio of talk and music, but the Men's Council has been patient in explaining the philosophy behind the program; that the music is intended as sugar-coating around a small, but mighty potent Christian message.

#### THE SPEAKER

Father Ginder, the present speaker, must be well known to readers of *Columbia*. He has written many an article for this magazine during the past eight years. His main work is at St. Charles College in Baltimore, the oldest and one of the largest preparatory seminaries in the country. But in spite of his heavy teaching schedule, he finds time to help as Associate Editor of *Our Sunday Visitor*!

Most of his *Columbia* articles reflected an interest in music, which he still follows with great enthusiasm. He is a Fellow of the American Guild of Organists, and has given occasional recitals on his favorite instrument. His published compositions are not works of genius, but they do show immense technical facility and considerable inspiration.

If you heard his program on January 16 and listened to his examples, from chopsticks to the Moonlight Sonata, and if you heard Brahms played during the January 23 talk, you can be sure that it was Father Ginder himself who was at the piano.

His speaking-style is curious. It must be heard to be appreciated. He claims he specializes in "horse-sense" and, indeed, his observations are certainly pretty shrewd; he uses short words and maneuvers his imagery with great dexterity.

The music on the program is safe in the hands of Paul Creston. Paul is the organist of St. Malachy's Church, New York. He has been a Guggenheim Fellow at Columbia University and has had his compositions played by many of the major symphony orchestras of the country. He knows what people like, and he's able to give it to them.

That's the setup, then. So far the Hour of Faith is being carried on about forty of the 175 stations of the Blue Network. That isn't bad for a start, in view of the fact that no money

changes hands, but it's only a start. Local stations are not bound to carry either *The Catholic Hour* or *The Hour of Faith*. They'll only do that if they can be assured that the time expended will earn them a proportionate amount of good-will.

If there is an N. B. C. or a Blue station near you, it could be featuring one of these programs. If it is, a note of appreciation or a postal-card would

do much to "oil the wheels of progress." If it is not, a written request would help matters. In cases where the time is already under contract, one might ask the management to transcribe the program and play it back at some more convenient hour. Concerted action will swing the matter. And don't forget: the Knights so far have \$46,000 invested in this particular apostolate!



### *Catholicity*

The catholicity of the Church was well demonstrated the other day in Westminster Cathedral. One morning at early Mass in the Blessed Sacrament Chapel an ebony-black Negro knelt at the Communion rail between a Canadian airman and a British sailor. Mass was being said by an English priest and served by a fair-haired Polish soldier. The priest who said the next Mass was a German. His server was a Dutch airman. In a chapel on the south side a Belgian priest was saying his Mass—served by a small knickerbockered Belgian boy, and in the Lady Chapel an Italian sacristan was busy with brush and dust-pan.—THE WANDERER, *St. Paul, Minn., March 23, 1944.*



### *Health Through Illness*

Disease is constructive; not destructive. It is benign; not malevolent. It exists to save human life—not to destroy it.

Disease—which means, literally, lack of ease or absence of health—comes into a man's life for three reasons: (1) as a warning; (2) as a punishment; (3) as a palliative or a cure. Even when it comes as a punishment, the Divine purpose is to save us from our follies rather than to penalize us for our sins.—THE NEW LEADER, *Madras, India, January 30, 1944.*

## SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

### POPE AND PRINCE

*If the Pope is, as every Catholic says and believes, the servant of Jesus Christ, why is it that the Pope is considered to hold so high a position amongst the great personages of the world? Did the Pope arrogate this position to himself?*

No, he did not. It has been explained before in these columns that the Pope, in the most formal of all documents, signs himself simply as "a Bishop of the Catholic Church." You cannot dispute that, for even non-Catholics acknowledge him as the Bishop of Rome, which he is. Also in certain other formal documents, the Pope describes himself as "the Servant of the servants of God." Nothing arrogant about that.

But for all that, the Pope, whilst he is in fact and deed the Bishop of Rome, is also a Prince; indeed, you may not improperly say that the Pope is the most eminent of all Princes. First of all, because he is a Sovereign, that is, Sovereign Ruler of the independent sovereign State of Vatican City. That establishes him amongst the sovereign rulers of the world.

Apart from that, however, the Pope is recognized by every secular government as being somewhat more exalted in rank than any other secular Prince—the word Prince is here used

as implying sovereign dominion. There is no secular ruler or potentate, be he either Emperor or King or President, or whatever be his style, but who does not, in the presence of the Roman Pope, acknowledge an equal and possibly even a superior.

Now do not get this wrong. Catholics do not presume to elevate the Chief Pastor of their Church as a personage excelling in dignity all other high personages. At the Congress of Vienna in 1815, which was a political and not an ecclesiastical assembly, it was decreed that the nuncios and legates of the Holy See should take precedence of the diplomatic representatives of all other Sovereign Princes and Powers. Hence it follows that in all world capitals where there is a Papal Nuncio he is the dean of the diplomatic corps and precedes all other ambassadors and ministers of legation. At Dublin, for instance, the Apostolic Nuncio ranks before all other diplomats accredited to the Irish capital.

But the princeship of the Pope dates back many centuries before the Congress of Vienna in 1815. It goes back to the days when the Apostolic See was the only stable government in Europe.

However, the position of the Pope as a Prince has no political signi-

ficance, save that of honor and respect, to Catholics anywhere in the world except in the domain of Vatican City, where the Pope is Sovereign and Ruler. The Pope has supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in every part of the world wherever he may be. But outside his own temporal domain his princely power assures him respect, as for any other Sovereign Ruler, but no political jurisdiction whatever.

#### RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE INQUISITION

*How do you reconcile the brutalities of the Inquisition and the ideal of Religious Liberty, which last, by the way, is one of the Four Freedoms for which we are supposed to be fighting?*

We don't. There are quite a few centuries between the activities of the Inquisition and the declaration on the Four Freedoms.

The administration of the Inquisition, which was a tribunal of judges to inquire into heresy in certain parts of Europe, and particularly into the anti-social activities of such heretics as the Albigenses and other disturbers of the social order, was committed to officials. Some of these officials were very harsh, and no Catholic historian denies it. But the people with whom these tribunals had to deal were distinguished generally for their obstinacy and also a disregard for the social laws. So their activities were inimical both to the Church and to the State.

But, and get this fact clear, the

Inquisition was not extended to the whole of the European countries—it was not extended to the British Isles or to the States of Germany. Yet in 1401 the English Parliament, without any apparent urging either by Rome or the Inquisition, passed the statute *De heretico comburendo* (regarding the burning of heretics) which ordained that heretics convicted of obstinate heresy by the ecclesiastical courts, were to be handed over to the secular arm. That was English civil law, not ecclesiastical law.

Actually those heretics who came under the ban of either the Inquisition or the civil power were generally persons whose principal aim was to upset the established civil and social order. Read up on the Lollards and the Cathari and the Albigeneses who today would have stood a good chance of being put into jail as disturbers of the public peace.

Three instances, which stand out as real assaults on the principle of religious liberty, are seldom mentioned in the perennial argument over the Inquisition. These were the penal laws against Catholics in England and Ireland; the enforcement by the sword of the religion of Islam by the Mohammedans; the suppression of religion by the Bolshevik regime under Lenin. And you cannot attribute any of these things to the Catholic Church or the Inquisition.

Religious Liberty is practically a modern ideal. In the days of the Inquisition there was, in Europe at all

events, only one religion, and that was the Catholic Religion. But just give a glance at what has happened to Religious Liberty since the 15th century.

Henry VIII, after he had separated England from the Holy See, chopped off the heads of those who maintained the Papal Primacy, but burned alive heretics who denied certain Catholic teachings. The Calvinists in 1553 burned alive Michael Servetus as a heretic according to Calvinistic doctrines. Elizabeth of England disemboweled Catholics, and not until the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 did Catholics in England have any civil rights at all. The Scots Presbyterians persecuted both Catholics and Episcopalians, and the Puritans under Cromwell continued this savage work of religious persecution. In New England the Puritans believed in Religious Liberty—for themselves, and the Protestants in Maryland carried on the penal laws against Catholics. The King of England is still forbidden by law to be a Catholic; and, to get right down to our own country, what was it that prevented Governor Alfred E. Smith from being elected President of the United States?

What kind of a hand did the Roman Inquisition have in all these things? Anyway, the Inquisition is not put before us as the best of all possible tribunals. Nor has the Church ever insisted that all the inquisitors were above reproach. They were not. So do not mix up the Middle Ages with the 20th century.

#### BIRTH CONTROL INFORMATION

*Has any nation included in its Penal Code laws against birth control, or the dissemination of information leading to family limitation?*

Actually the laws of the United States forbid the dissemination of information regarding family limitation, as well as the sale of contraceptives. But, so it would seem, these laws are more honored in the breach than in their observance. Most countries have no laws that prescribe the dissemination of birth control information.

But the Swiss Confederation, better known as Switzerland, in the Swiss New Federal Code, published a few years ago, goes all out in banning anything that deals with birth prevention.

According to the Swiss Penal Code, it is against the law to advertise or display publicly contraceptive articles that in any way violate public decency. It is also unlawful to send through the mails articles or information or anything unsolicited that deals with contraception, or to send such things to persons who have no professional interest in the matter.

Under the Swiss Penal Code is prohibited for the general public the exhibition, possession, sale or conveyance of immoral pictures, publications or films. Specially heavy penalties are imposed on anyone who exhibits such films or pictures to minors who are under eighteen years of age.

This new Swiss law is not the hasty work of persons who are funda-

mentally opposed to birth control or family limitation propaganda. For nearly half a century the legislative body responsible for the new law has engaged itself in research and study. It consulted all the possible factors that such a law might involve. And only after lengthy and profound discussion and careful consideration of every possible argument against the prohibitions, was the law put before the Swiss Federal Legislature and passed.

#### ASPRILIO PACELLI

*Can you tell me anything about Asprilio Pacelli, when he lived and for what he was distinguished? I am interested because his family name is the same as that of Pius XII.*

You have asked a most interesting question, because this Asprilio Pacelli was a very distinguished ancestor of His present Holiness Pope Pius XII. A brief account of his life, to which was contributed a preface by Monsignor Casimiri, Master of the Patriarchal Lateran Basilica, was published by the Vatican Polyglot Press a few years ago.

But to give a brief biography of Asprilio Pacelli. He was born in 1570 at the village of Vasciano, near Narni in Umbria. As a boy he first studied the rudiments of music under his par-

ish priest, who had himself received a sound musical training. By the time he was thirty he had already become famous. Between the years 1591 and 1600 many musical compositions by him had already been published in collections of songs and psalms.

By the year 1601 Asprilio Pacelli had become so famed throughout Italy that he was appointed Master of the Choir in the German College in Rome. In that year he published a collection of madrigals.

But further promotions were yet to come to him. In 1602 he was appointed Director of the Chapel of the Vatican Basilica; that is, of St. Peter's. But important as this new assignment might be, Pacelli did not hold it for long.

Sigismund III, King of Poland and of Sweden, offered him the post of Master of the Chapel Royal at Warsaw, and Pacelli accepted the appointment. He remained at Warsaw until his death in 1623, in the fifty-third year of his life.

Whether Asprilio Pacelli was a direct or a collateral ancestor of Pope Pius XII is not exactly known. But enough of him is known to show that scholarly distinction seems to have been inherent in the family which produced a Pope.

